THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG WORKLOAD, JOB SATISFACTION, AND BURNOUT OF EXTENSION 4-H YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONALS FROM SIX LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

Carrie Beth Stark

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Program:
Education

June 2011

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

The Relationship Between Workload, Job Satisfaction and Burnout of Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals from Six Land Grant Universities

By

Carrie Stark

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this ***disquisition*** complies with North Dakota State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ABSTRACT

Stark, Carrie Beth, Ph.D., Education Program, College of Human Development and Education, North Dakota State University, June 2011. The Relationship Among Workload, Job Satisfaction, and Burnout of Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals from Six Land-Grant Universities. Major Professor: Dr. Myron A. Eighmy.

The purpose of this study was to determine what job responsibilities Extension 4-H youth development professionals (n = 241) chose to spend their work time doing and how the workload related to their job satisfaction and burnout. They were asked to rank order seven common, predetermined job responsibilities, based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC), and to identify their level of job satisfaction and burnout. The study utilized quantitative methods for gathering data from 4-H youth development Extension professionals from 6 land-grant universities.

Over the past 25 years, there has been an increase in research investigating burnout and job satisfaction. Burnout is a serious issue that can lead to decreased productivity for the employee and increased costs for the employer. Finding the connections among burnout, job satisfaction, and work environment is important to help reduce problems, including work overload. Based on the previous research on workload, burnout, and job satisfaction, 4-H youth development professionals are prime candidates for experiencing low job satisfaction and increased burnout, which may lead to professionals leaving the organization early.

To determine the workload, 4-H youth development professionals were asked to rank seven job responsibilities for each of the domains that are common to the youth development profession. The job responsibility that had the lowest mean of any from the six domains was #1 "using volunteer committees" in the volunteerism domain, with 71.9% of the respondents ranking it as one of the top two job responsibilities within the domain.

Determining job satisfaction related to the individual job responsibilities was the first measurement used in identifying the level of job satisfaction in the survey. The youth development domain's job responsibility #6 "develop programs to practice life skills" provided the respondents the greatest degree of job satisfaction ($M = 1.93$, $SD = 0.72$) of any of the responsibilities with the six 4-H PRKC domains. The second instrument used to assess job satisfaction for 4-H youth development professionals was the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), in which the mean score was 3.72 ($SD = 0.79$). The third and final measurement used to determine job satisfaction was the self-reported overall level of job satisfaction. The mean for the self-reported overall job satisfaction was 2.20 ($SD = 0.83$).

The greatest degree of burnout ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.26$) within any of the domains was in the youth development domain with job responsibility #7 "dealing with conflict management." This job responsibility also indicated a negative relationship between the workload rank score and job responsibility burnout ($r = -0.250$). The overall mean for the Burnout survey was 3.84 ($SD = 0.86$). The greatest burnout came from the work within the youth development domain.

The 4-H youth development professionals reported feeling very little overall burnout related to their job. The overall self-reported mean for burnout was 2.75 ($SD = 1.17$). They also reported being satisfied with their current job ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 0.83$).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When I began this voyage in 2008, I did not know what a journey it would be! I would like to start by saying thank you to my adviser, Dr. Myron Eighmy, who was willing to join me as a leader and mentor in the middle of the journey. Your hours of dedication in helping me through this entire process are invaluable. I would also like to say thank you to my first adviser, Dr. Mark Schmidt, who, unfortunately, was not able to be here for the end. You were a true mentor, and I will always remember your passion for education and will continue to carry your legacy forward as I move through my career. A huge thank you goes to my committee members, Dr. Greg Lardy, Dr. Deb Gebeke, and Dr. Rachelle Vettern. Your hard work and hours of reading are greatly appreciated! Rachelle, you and I began our journeys around the same time, and I am so glad you are with me as I finish. You have been a great friend and support through this process.

I would not have made it through my journey without the love and support of my parents, Phil and Cheryle Andre. Thank you, Dad, for giving up Mom during my times of need when I was calling her crying because I could not do it anymore! Mom, you have been my rock through this entire excursion. Without both of you hounding me and encouraging me, I could not have done it! I would not have been able to complete the journey without your willingness to come up and help me out when I needed it most. I would also like to thank my sister, Jolana, for your encouragement as I called to vent.

To my co-workers in Idaho, I cannot express enough gratitude for your patience and understanding while I moved through the process. To Arlinda, you have been the best boss through this process. Claudine, you are one of the greatest editor I could have ever found!! Charlotte and Dean Hammel, you have been more than patient, and I am so thankful that

you were willing to work with me to complete my journey! To the 4-H youth development professionals throughout the state, thank you, first, for participating in the study and, second, for allowing me the freedom to get this done.

I would like to thank someone who came in at the last minute and saved me, both through his words of encouragement and through his editing! Dr. Richard Craig, I owe you one!

The last two individuals I would like to thank for helping me get through this journey are two of the most important people in my life, my husband and son! Jim, you were incredible throughout the entire journey. You have pushed me to be the best individual I can be and to make sure that I finished! Thank you so much, and I love you! The last person I would like to thank is my son, Kody, to whom I truly dedicate this dissertation. You were thrust into my journey and have rolled with the punches along the way! You are an incredible 6-year-old little boy, and I am so thankful to be your mom!!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION

Research and teaching are the missions of most of America's public colleges and universities, but for more than 100 land-grant colleges and universities, there is a third mission of outreach or Extension (U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA], 2010). The goal of Extension is to take research from the college or university and to deliver it in a usable manner to the people. Information disseminated by Extension is intended to solve community problems or promote change within a community or individuals (USDA, 2010).

Land-grant universities were established to educate U.S. citizens in agriculture, home economics, mechanical arts, and other practical professions. In other words, the goal of the land-grant universities was to make college accessible to anyone (USDA, 2010). In 1862, the Morrill Act was passed which provided the funding to create a land-grant university in every state. While it is important to make college affordable, it is also important to spread the research findings across the state. Therefore, Cooperative Extension was established in 1914 with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act. This legislation provided a formal partnership with the land-grant institutions, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state governments, and county governments. The goal of the Agricultural Extension work, based on the Smith-Lever Act, was to "(a) develop practical applications of research knowledge, and (b) give instruction and practical demonstrations of existing or improved practices or technologies in agriculture" (USDA, 2010, para. 1).

Changes in the Cooperative Extension System

Extension started as a collaborative effort to teach farmers new farming techniques, give cooking lessons to women, and form community 4-H clubs for boys and girls (which

taught the boys how to grow corn and the girls how to preserve vegetables and fruits); Extension has expanded to an organization which provides opportunities for both the general public and individuals to make changes, solve problems, and gain new knowledge (Crossgrove, Scheer, Conklin, Jones, & Safrit, 2005).

According to the UDSA (2011), the number of U.S. farms is slightly increasing, but the demographics of those farms are changing. Those farms are becoming smaller with fewer commodity crops being grown. With this increase in the number of farms and the changing demographics of those farms, Miller (2010) indicates the demand for agricultural graduates will increase 5% between 2010 and 2015. These changes with traditional agriculture will affect the Extension system in several ways. The audience whom Extension serves will become more diverse. According to USDA (2010), Extension will continue to meet the needs of the public at the local level but in a different way.

The second way Extension will be affected is in the recruitment and retention of county Extension professionals. Many Extension employees have traditionally come from farm backgrounds and have previously benefitted from Extension programming. With changes to the clientele and the entire Extension system, the pool of traditional employees will continue to change or possibly decrease (Bachtel, 1989). Borr and Young (2010) report that 74% of the Extension professionals in North Dakota plan on leaving their current positions within the next 10 years, and fewer than 15% plan on moving into another position within Extension. According to the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA, 2008), the average number of service years for field staff (county Extension professionals) is 19 years, meaning that, in 10-15 years, there will be more retirements and a need for new employees. With the elevated attrition rate, many of the vacant positions

could remain unfilled, thus increasing the remaining employees' workload and stress levels (Borr & Young, 2010).

The funding for Cooperative Extension comes from federal, state, and local funds. The recent economic declines have forced many state Cooperative Extension Systems to defend their budgets. According to Fischer (2009), with the large cuts that Extension is taking across the country, there is a shift in how the institutions both deliver and finance their outreach mission. Fischer identified seven state Extension programs (Ohio, Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, Louisiana, Idaho, and Oregon) which are making big changes. Two of the seven states are making major shifts, both in structure and administrative duties, to a more regional focus. These changes were made to eliminate administrative costs. Iowa State University Extension eliminated the 100 county-based districts and opened 20 regional centers, eliminating the county and area director positions. Michigan State University Extension has eliminated 82 county Extension director positions and hired 13 district coordinators who each oversee 5 to 10 counties. This change reduced the number of administrative positions within the system. In addition to the states that have been affected by severe budget cuts, 39 states had a decrease in higher education budgets for fiscal year 2010 (Johnson, Oliff, & Williams, 2010).

Not only are state budgets dealing with major cuts, but county governments are faced with budget deficits. Even though policymakers at the state and county level see the importance of Extension programs, many people question whether these programs should continue to be funded by public dollars or move to more private support by charging the participants user fees (Kalambokidis, 2004).

Moore (as cited in Kalambokidis, 2004) explained that, in order to secure public support at the county and state levels, the government agency (Cooperative Extension in this case) must be able to articulate what Moore called the *public value* of the services provided. When the clientele and stakeholders see the value of a service, it is much easier to get support for public funding. This gain in support includes being able to show the public value to direct participants and explaining this value to those who are not direct recipients of the programs, including key stakeholders who have little knowledge of Extension. There are certain conditions, called public sector economics, which address the challenge of obtaining public funding. The conditions include what are considered to be "classic cases of market failure: imperfect information, externalities, public goods, and natural monopolies, as well as the desire of a community to ensure fairness and justice" (para. 4). The welfare of the community will improve when action is taken on the conditions described above. This action does not always require government involvement.

According to Kalambokidis (2004), when the University of Minnesota Extension Service saw a need to develop strong statements regarding its public value in 2002, the agency developed a two-hour workshop to train professionals how to create strong public-value statements. As a group, the Extension professionals came up with six economic terms, wrote a definition for each term, created examples of free-market outcomes, and developed examples of the items as they pertained to Extension. Kalambokidis (2004) provided an example of the group's efforts which includes the economic term *external benefits (costs) for consumption.* The definition of this term is "the use of a good or service confers benefits (costs) on someone other than those directly involved in the transaction" (para. 14). The free-market outcome for this economic term is when "the consumer fails to

fully consider the external benefit (cost) and consumes less (more) of the good than society desires" (para. 14). The Extension examples the group came up with were wastewater treatment and youth development programs. Another example was the economic term *imperfect information* which was defined as "when information available to the consumers is poor or inadequate, the government provides information (a service) so that consumers can make better choices" (para, 14). The free-market outcome of imperfect information was "when consumers cannot make the best choices for themselves, because they are inadequately informed about the products they purchase" (para. 14). The examples of Extension programming were nutrition education, soil management education for agriculture producers, and Master Gardener programming.

Based on the Kalambokidis (2004) article, the University of Minnesota Extension professionals determined the next steps after completing the workshop. The most important step was documenting the impacts of Extension programming and public-value statements. While the pilot program focused on established programs and the lack of impact data for new Extension programs, there was a need to address the inadequacy of documentation through policies which support those teams that created evaluation systems for new programs. It was also important to convey the message to pertinent stakeholders, including the government officials who set funding for Extension (both county and state) as well as citizens who elect those government officials and are recipients of Extension programs.

Why Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals

The 4-H youth development program is an integral part of the Cooperative Extension System. According to USDA (2010), 4-H youth development programming is defined as follows:

> 4-H youth development —cultivates important life skills in youth that build character and assist them in making appropriate life and career choices. At-risk youth participate in school retention and enrichment programs. Youth learn science, math, social skills, and much more, through hands-on projects and activities. (para. 15)

There are 4-H youth development professionals in almost every county and region of the country who carry out this work. Like others in the youth development field, these professionals are faced with unique problems regarding job responsibilities and expectations.

The least understood or studied profession in the field of human services is youth development (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2003). Although several million professionals are estimated to work in youth development, the Annie E. Casey Foundation (2003) observed:

> youth services is the least documented, least understood, and probably the most varied field we studied. There is no national data set on youth workers, or on youth-serving programs . . . much of the data is unreliable and often inaccurate . . . the lack of good information about youth workers and what they do stands in sharp contrast to documented benefits of youth programs. (p. 12)

Astroth and Lindstrom (2008) found that the youth development field is characterized by high turnover. One reason is low pay. Many of the enthusiastic young individuals who join the youth development profession often leave early to take a better-paying job. This field is also plagued by long and irregular work hours. Professionals are often expected to manage heavy workloads, receive low pay, work irregular hours, and are

provided little support for the work they do. In many cases, it is these factors that cause the high turnover and low job satisfaction.

According to Crossgrove et al. (2005), those individuals who enter the field of youth development are not well compensated for their work. For an organization to function properly, it must have the commitment and loyalty of its workers. It is the workers' skills, pride, dedication, and needs that are required to move forward. Astroth (2007) said it is the passion for the mission of the organization that keeps a youth development professional going, but the lack of adequate compensation can be a major factor in a premature departure from the profession.

Astroth (2007) conducted a study of the 4-H youth development workforce to review and analyze the pool of professionals. There has been a decline in the number of full-time equivalent employees (FTEs) who are dedicated to 4-H youth development programming reported by 48% of the states since 1990. When individuals, rather than FTEs, were evaluated, 54% of the states reported an even greater decline in the workforce.

Astroth (2007) found that many states have seen a shift in 4-H youth development staffing due to recent retirements, buyouts, downsizing, reclassification, and budget decreases. In the early 1990s, there were more county 4-H youth development agents/educators, but in the past 10 to 15 years, these positions were being replaced with paraprofessionals. Paraprofessionals have titles such as program coordinators and program assistants. One state reported that, because of decreased state and federal funding, it replaced many former 4-H agent (faculty) positions who had 100% 4-H youth development responsibilities with program assistants (paraprofessionals/non-faculty). Astroth (2007)

stated that 53% of the states expected the Extension agents/educators to do 4-H programming regardless of their major program area emphasis.

Statement of the Problem

With all the budget cuts and reductions, it is even more important to retain highly qualified educators who will move the Cooperative Extension Service forward and maintain its success now and in the future (Cooper & Graham, 2001). Strong and Harder (2009) stated that the net cost for each employee who leaves the organization was estimated to be $80,000 per year for the state Extension program. The retention of Extension professionals was also a challenge due to low salaries, downsizing, and an increased workload. Keeping highly qualified professionals while experiencing widespread budget reductions has been a continuing problem for Extension as staff members are asked to take on more responsibilities with less financial and human support (Senyurekli, Dworkin, & Dickinson, 2006). Not only is the monetary issue prevalent, increased employee burnout is also a national issue for Cooperative Extension (Strong & Harder, 2009).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine how Extension 4-H youth development professionals rank a set of common, predetermined job responsibilities, based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC), and to find the correlation of that workload to job satisfaction and burnout. The study utilized quantitative methods for gathering data from Extension professionals who work within the 4-H youth development program at the University of Idaho, Montana State University, the University

of Wyoming, Colorado State University, Washington State University, and Oregon State University.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. Based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (also known as the 4-H PRKC) domains, how do 4-H youth development professionals rank the associated job responsibilities?
2. Is there a correlation between workload and job satisfaction of 4-H youth development professionals, and what is the correlation?
3. What is the correlation between workload and burnout in Extension 4-H youth development professionals?

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

A delimitation of the study was the population of Extension professionals from the University of Idaho, Washington State University, Montana State University, Colorado State University, the University of Wyoming, and Oregon State University who work in 4-H youth development. Another delimitation to this study was that any Extension professionals who had 4-H youth development responsibilities in their position descriptions, without regard to percentage of time, were invited to participate.

The study was limited because the job responsibilities and workload were self-reported and retrospective. The results were generalizable to those who have similar job responsibilities in 4-H youth development. The results were also generalizable because the job responsibilities were based on a set of core competencies called the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC) which were developed at a national

level and used by states to define the responsibilities of the 4-H youth development professionals. Another limitation of this study was that there were only 56 job responsibilities that were reviewed. There were 297 job-related competencies within the 4-H PRKC model that could have been translated into job responsibilities. This study was also limited to an online (computer-based) survey.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined to provide a common understanding and context for the study.

Cooperative Extension System (Extension System): Federal, state, and locally funded agency, regulated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which has a state Extension Service in every state and U.S. territory (USDA, 2010)

County Extension Educators: These individuals typically work in one or several local jurisdictions providing program leadership, program management, development, and evaluation at the local level. These individuals typically have either a bachelor's or master's degree, and are considered educators or faculty within Extension. Events and activities comprise an important part of their job, but these activities are not the exclusive focus (Astroth, 2007).

State 4-H Program Director: These individuals serve as the program administrators for 4-H programs throughout the state. Sometimes called program leaders, they provide overall 4-H leadership and provide supervision for the state 4-H office personnel. Typically, these individuals are 100% administrative but may have a few programmatic responsibilities. They are similar to academic department heads (Astroth, 2007).

State-Level Staff/Specialist: This person typically works with the state 4-H office/center and has statewide job expectations. He or she may live elsewhere in the state and not necessarily be housed on the land-grant university campus. The person usually has a terminal degree (highest academic degree awarded in a given field) but may, instead, have a master's-level degree. Responsibilities may include developing curriculum, providing program leadership or subject matter duties, teaching (including agents, volunteers, and youth), program development, evaluation, etc. Such a person could have an educational role through managing and coordinating 4-H events. State 4-H program leaders should not be included in this category. This category does not include support staff or secretarial staff (Astroth, 2007).

Program Associate, Program Assistant, Coordinator, and Paraprofessional: These individuals typically work under the supervision of the educator or specialist. The position may not always require a bachelor's degree. These individuals are primarily responsible for conducting events and activities (Astroth, 2007).

Support Staff/Administrative Assistants: These individuals typically work with the Extension office, providing clerical or support services for others. They do not teach programs, develop curriculum, although they may assist others at programs and events in a supporting role (Astroth, 2007).

1862 Land-Grant University: Land-grant institutions were established by the passage of the first Morrill Act (1862). The Morrill Act was intended to provide a broad segment of the population with a practical education that had direct relevance to daily lives (Astroth, 2007).

4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC): The most current and comprehensive research and knowledge representing the field of 4-H youth development, including the competencies that are essential to conducting 4-H youth development programs. Six integrated, yet distinct, areas (or domains) were identified. Those six were as follows: (a) youth development; (b) youth program development; (c) volunteerism; (d) equity, access, and opportunity; (e) partnerships; and (f) organizational systems (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004).

Organization of Remaining Chapters

Chapter Two includes the Review of Literature and the theoretical basis for this study. The chapter is divided into the following sections: The 4-H Youth Development Professional, the 4-H Professional Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC), Workload, Professional Burnout, and Job Satisfaction. Chapter Three describes the Methodology and procedures to be used in the study as well as the Data Analysis procedures used. Chapter Four provides the Results, and Chapter Five summarizes the study and findings along with stating Conclusions and Implications. Recommendations for further research are found in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER TWO. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to determine how Extension 4-H youth development professionals rank a set of common, predetermined job responsibilities, based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC), and to find the correlation of that workload to job satisfaction and burnout.

The literature review focuses on five major areas: the 4-H profession, the 4-H PRKC, Workload, burnout, and Job Satisfaction. These focus areas were selected to support the need of this study based on the research questions. The 4-H profession is characterized by a large workload, so an understanding of the 4-H profession and its challenges is helpful to the study.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. Based on the 4-H PRKC domains, how do 4-H youth development professionals rank the associated job responsibilities?
2. Is there a correlation between workload and job satisfaction of 4-H youth development professionals, and what is the correlation?
3. What is the correlation between workload and burnout in Extension 4-H youth development professionals?

The 4-H Youth Development Professional

In the summer of 2006, a survey was conducted to determine the structure of the 4-H profession. Questions were asked regarding staffing structure, staffing trends and changes, ideal staffing models, and challenges to 4-H staffing (Astroth, 2007).

Staffing Structure

Based on responses from all 50 states, Astroth (2007) was able to divide staff into three categories. The categories were as follows:

- State staff: There were a total of 399.35 FTEs in state offices across the country. Those numbers range from 0.25 to 21 FTEs in any one office, with an average of 8 FTEs in a state office (para. 30).
- District/area 4-H staff: This category is not a common structure in the 4-H profession. Only 10 states reported having any type of district-level staff. Of those 10, there were varying types of staffing structures, from program leadership to program coordinators (para. 32).
- County 4-H staff: "Extension programming is primarily thought of as delivered at the county level" (para. 34), and 95% of the states reported having county-based staff. It was reported that 67% of the states had "an Extension presence in all counties in their states" (para. 34). There were 1,975 FTEs reported as working 100% in 4-H youth development. "When asked how many total county or parish FTEs" worked in 4-H youth development, that number rose to 2,802 FTEs because some county staff members have various programming responsibilities" (para. 35). This category was also where the number of paraprofessionals who worked at the county level was reported. In addition to the 2,802 FTEs who were educators, there were an additional 1,060 FTEs who worked as 4-H program assistants, program coordinators, or paraprofessionals (para. 36).

Staffing Trends and Shifts

There have been significant changes to the staffing structure of 4-H youth development in the past 20 years. Astroth (2007) found that 58% of the state 4-H program leaders reported the number of state staff FTEs funded with appropriated dollars had decreased since 1990 while 28% of the states reported that their state staff FTEs had increased. Furthermore, 9% of the state 4-H program leaders responded that their state staff was the same size as it was in 1990, and 4% of the state 4-H program leaders did not know if their state staff had increased or decreased. One-third of the state 4-H program leaders said there were not any FTEs funded by grant dollars at the state level. Moreover, 28% of the state 4-H program leaders reported only one such position, while 17% said they had two such positions, and 9% of the state 4-H program leaders stated that three such positions existed within their state. There were three state 4-H program leaders who reported having between six and ten such positions at the state level.

Based on the Astroth (2007) study, county staffing-level changes were similar to the state levels. Forty-eight percent of the states reported a decrease in the number of FTEs working with county 4-H programming, and 28% had seen an increase in 4-H FTEs since 1990. There were 15% who reported no change and 9% who did not know. The percentage of states that reported a decrease increased to 54% when the total number of people was counted, rather than the number of FTEs.

Astroth (2007) reported that 56% of the states described an increase in paraprofessional positions at the county level. There were 13% of the state 4-H program leaders who reported a decrease in this type of staff, and 13% of the states did not see any change in these numbers. Seventeen percent of the states did not know if there was a

change in this type of staffing. One state 4-H program leader reported, "Because of decreased state and federal funding, we have replaced many former 100% 4-H agent positions with program assistants" (Astroth, 2007, para. 42).

Challenges to 4-H Youth Development Staffing

One of the concerns with 4-H staffing, as reported in the Astroth (2007) study, was the need to increase the number of 4-H youth development professionals because of the burnout and excessive workloads which 4-H staff members encounter. Astroth quoted a Brookings Institute report that found "70 percent of those in their survey strongly or somewhat agreed that they always have too much work to do" (2007, para. 81). There was a perception, as with other youth development fields, that there is a high burnout and turnover rate in 4-H work.

Perceptions of 4-H Youth Development Professionals

Astroth (2007) found that, while time and energy have been spent at the federal and state levels on teacher certification and student-to-teacher ratios, there are more children who are spending a major portion of their lives in non-formal educational settings. According to the research, a student spends most of the time in non-formal activities that occur during out-of-school hours. These hours play a key role in the positive development of young people.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA, 2010), 4-H youth development is the official youth development component of the USDA and the land-grant university system, administered by Cooperative Extension. One of the largest non-formal educational programs in country, 4-H reached over 6,000,000 youths through a variety of delivery methods in 2008.

According to Wessel and Wessel (1982), when Extension began in 1914, the individuals who worked in 4-H were considered club agents, and the job was referred to junior Extension work. The authors also said that it was not until 1952 that 4-H was formally granted equal status with the other divisions within the USDA and that this attitude began to change.

In a review of past literature about 4-H professionals and their attitudes, Astroth (2007) found the following:

- In 1960, a federal study was conducted with both "Extension staff and clientele in 13 western states" (para. 14). The study was designed to determine "their attitudes toward 4-H work, objectives and methods" (para. 14). The study found that the research participants thought 4-H work was for those with less experience or education. The research participants reported an attitude that 4-H youth development work was a good training ground for what was perceived as regular Extension work with adults.
- In 1984, the National Association of Extension 4-H Agents conducted a study to determine how 4-H youth development professionals were perceived. The researchers found a wide variety of ideas about what the image and qualifications for 4-H youth development professionals should be, and those ideas were different depending on geographic location. The study results indicated that formal education levels should increase for 4-H youth development professionals and that Extension needed to address the "faculty status, compensation levels, professional titles and hiring

requirements" (para. 15) as they related to 4-H youth development professionals.

Astroth (2007) also reported a shift in the image of the 4-H professional in the 1990s. Perceptions were that 4-H work, which had traditionally been done by Extension 4-H faculty who had undergraduate and graduate degrees, could be done by paraprofessionals or program assistants who may only have an associate's degree or a high school diploma. There was also a perception that 4-H work is just child's play and could be done by anyone. It was because of this attitude that the 4-H Professional Research, Knowledge, and Competencies were created.

4-H Youth Development Professionals Versus Other Youth Development Professionals

According to the Carnegie Corporation of New York (Huebner, Walker & McFarland, 2003), there are more than 17,000 youth-serving organizations with an estimated 300,000 individuals who work either in full- or part-time positions. These organizations have focused their energy in creating a positive environment for the youths involved in their programs (Evans, Sicafuse, & Killian, 2009).

After conducting the literature review, there was only one study that described the characteristics of 4-H youth development workers. Evans et al. (2009) compared 4-H youth development professionals with workers from other youth-serving organizations. Of the 4-H youth development professionals who participated in the survey, 81% were satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs, and 84% were planning to still be working with youths 5 years in the future. One difference between 4-H workers and other youth workers was in

their years of service. The 4-H workers had worked for the organization longer than other respondents and more often reported the desire to work for their organization in the future.

4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC)

According to Harder and Dooley (2007), there was a need to make sure the 4-H youth development professionals were well-prepared to handle the demands of their jobs. Based on the need, a group of 4-H professionals identified a base of 4-H knowledge and research. This knowledge and research base was created to help guide the 4-H professional's efforts in working with and on behalf of youth. In 1985, the knowledge base became known as the 4-H Professional, Research, and Knowledge. The 4-H PRK developed a set of competencies that reflected the true nature of 4-H youth development work (Harder & Dooley, 2007).

As indicated by Stone and Rennekamp (2004), the research and knowledge base was updated in 2004 to include competencies essential for conducting 4-H youth development programs. Thus, the 4-H Professional Research, Knowledge, and Competencies, known as the 4-H PRKC, were created. This framework focused on the important elements of working with young people and provided guidelines for 4-H youth development professionals. The updates from 2004 were used as key resources for the following: (a) individuals preparing for a career in the field of youth development; (b) individuals just entering or returning to the 4-H workforce; (c) designing job descriptions or hiring new youth workers; (d) designing the training and learning experiences for 4-H educators and volunteer staff; (e) building individual learning plans or performance standards; (f) focusing on strategies critical to attracting, developing, and retaining an outstanding, diverse 4-H workforce; (g) adding value to individual career development; (h) professional association initiatives; and (i) increasing research and evaluation efforts for 4-H youth development.

When the 4-H PRK was updated to the 4-H PRKC, an extensive study was conducted by a task force of 4-H youth development professionals across the nation; the research was led by Stone and Rennekamp (2004). This study was a comprehensive body of research on the 4-H PRKC and became the basis for other research studies (Harder & Dooley, 2007; Stone & Rennekamp, 2004; Subramaniam, Heck, & Carlos, 2008). As a result of the study by Stone and Rennekamp (2004), the National 4-H Leadership Trust and 4-H National Headquarters officially adopted the updated 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies for use throughout the 4-H system. Addressing the complexity and sophistication of the 4-H youth development profession, the domains, topics, and competencies within the 4-H PRKC included the knowledge, ability, and performance that are essential to conducting exceptional 4-H youth development work. According to Stone and Rennekamp (2004), the 4-H PRKC may be used "with confidence in designing job descriptions, individual learning plans, performance management, broad professional development strategies, and professional association initiatives" (p. 3). The complete 4-H PRKC model can be found in Appendix E.

There were two sources (Harder & Dooley, 2007; Stone & Rennekamp, 2004) which described the 4-H PRKC model. Within this model, there are six integrated, yet distinct, domains: youth development; youth program development; volunteerism; equity, access, and opportunity; partnerships; and organizational systems. Each of these primary domains contains a series of multiple topics, components to those topics, and specific competencies. Table 1 is an example of the way the 4-H PRKC is designed with each tier. There is an example from each of the six domains included in Table 1.

In a study conducted by Subramaniam et al. (2008) for the California 4-H youth development program, the 4-H PRKC self-assessments were used and adapted as an online instrument to determine the 4-H professional's competencies. The self-assessment was created in 2004 as part of the National 4-H Professional Development Task Force's report to be used by individuals to assess levels of competency within the six domains of the 4-H PRKC. As a result of this study, the job expectations/responsibilities of 4-H professionals in California changed.

Table 1. Example of 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies, 2004

Domain	Topic	Component	Competency
Youth Development	Youth Development Theory	Positive Youth Development	Understands history, changes, and trends of the roles of youth in society
Partnerships	Youth-Adult Partnerships	Creating Partnerships	Facilitates dialogue that ensures a youth voice
Organizational Systems	Organizational Effectiveness	Knowledge of the Organization	Displays commitment to CES[a],4-H mission
Youth Program Development	Situation Analysis	Setting Priorities and Securing Commitment	Works with advisory boards and committees to obtain input regarding program priorities
Volunteerism	Organizational Readiness	Developing Volunteer Positions	Develops written volunteer position descriptions
Equity, Access, and Opportunity	Communication	Open Attitude	Displays an awareness of their own communication, learning, and teaching styles; acceptance of others' styles; and willingness to learn new skills to bridge differences

Note. Adapted from Stone and Rennekamp (2004).[a]CES = Cooperative Extension System

Before the 2004 update, the 4-H PRKC was called the 4-H PRK. According to Stone and Rennekamp (2004), some states used this model to define the role of 4-H professionals. Hutchins (1990) stated that the University of Minnesota Extension Service used the original PRK taxonomy to develop a framework for the organizational change where 4-H educators specialized in a specific topic area. After adopting this new organization, the Minnesota 4-H professionals focused their expertise on the 4-H PRK domains: youth development, educational design, and volunteerism.

Workload

Workload of Extension Professionals

Gunn (1978) addressed the importance of vacations for Extension professionals. Although Extension is a university program, there are not the typical breaks which coincide with the academic calendar (such as spring break, summer, winter break, etc). Extension employees have the flexibility to schedule their own days off work but frequently fail to do so. With the absence of formal scheduled time off, Extension employees assign vacations a lower priority. Vacations are frequently not taken until the workload eases, but often, vacation time is ignored. Gunn addressed the thoughts of medical professionals who said that vacations are important and a necessity to ward off physical and mental illnesses.

According to Homan, Kleinschmidt, Bowen-Ellzey, and Trice (2006), Extension professionals face several issues affecting their workload. One such issue is the split between the county educator and administrative roles. Across the country, state Extension programs rely on county Extension directors or chairs to complete administrative duties for the county. Administrative duties include oversight and leadership of county budgets,

financial management, personnel-related management, and building positive stakeholder relations.

A study by Homan et al. (2006) of the Ohio State University Extension system investigated how individuals who serve in split-director roles perceive their positions. The authors found that 44% of the respondents were involved in agriculture and natural resource programming, that 37% were in family and consumer science programming, and that 22% were 4-H youth development educators.

Those professionals who work in youth development are faced with challenges and opportunities on a regular basis. Astroth and Lindstrom (2008) found that one of the issues in youth development is the high rate of employee turnover. The authors found there were several reasons for this turnover. First, the financial compensation for youth workers, including those who work in 4-H youth development, is not very high. The profession tends to attract young, energetic individuals who see it as a job, not a career, and may leave within a few years for a higher-paying position. The second issue facing youth development professionals is long and irregular work hours. Working occasional evenings and weekends may disrupt a worker's personal life, leading to burnout, and is the principle reason youth workers cited for leaving the profession. The Annie E. Casey Foundation (2003) published a national report which cited burnout, extreme workloads, long hours, and high turnover as part of youth development work.

According to Kutilek, Conklin, and Gunderson (2002), a research study was commissioned by the Joint Council for Extension Professionals (JCEP) to study work/life issues for Extension professionals. The study included a random sample of employed Extension professionals from across the United States. The research participants were

asked to report on work/life balance issues. Those issues identified were workload, time, control/balances, and personal attitude/expectations. The factors given as the greatest influences in the number of hours worked were one's own self, clientele, and immediate supervisors. The respondents also reported that a reduction in workload would be one way their work/life balance could be better supported.

In an unpublished 2008 study conducted by Stark, the University of Idaho 4-H youth development program reviewed the workload of Extension professionals who worked in 4-H youth development (including Extension educators, program coordinators, program assistants, and office assistants). The purpose of the study was to determine employee workload at various points throughout the year. The researcher also studied job responsibilities to determine how much time faculty and staff actually spent on those tasks throughout the year.

Stark (2008) asked participants what type of compensation they received, if any, for hours worked over the normal 40-hour work week. Of the Extension educators, only three received flex time while eight were exempt employees, which meant they did not receive compensatory time or overtime pay. The program coordinators and program assistants had similar responses with 25 of the 32 respondents receiving compensatory time for hours worked over 40 per week. Only three people in each of the job-title categories were exempt employees. The office assistants who responded to this survey received overtime pay.

Table 2 provides the self-reported, average number of hours worked per week, based on the individual job title. It also includes information about the average number of hours the University of Idaho Extension 4-H youth development professionals worked during the summer months, typically the busiest time of year (Stark, 2008).

Table 2. Average Number of Hours Worked by University of Idaho Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals

4-H Youth Development Job Title	Number of Respondents	Average Number Hours Worked Per Week	Summer time Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week
Overall	44	40.10	44.25
Extension Educator	11	47.34	51.14
Program Coordinator	22	45.31	52.34
Program Assistant	8	33.20	42.75
Office Assistant	2	38.12	40.00
Other	1	35.00	35.00

Note. Adapted from Stark (2008)

According to Stark (2008), on average, the University of Idaho 4-H youth development professionals had 2.8 night meetings per month and worked an average of 8.7 weekends per year. This number was much greater among the Extension educators and program coordinators, with Extension educators reporting an average of 4.1 night meetings per month and 13.2 weekends per year. The program coordinators reported 3.7 night meetings per month and 15.7 weekends per year.

Stark (2008) also reported that there were two survey items which asked for the number of hours the 4-H youth development professional worked beyond the normal work hours (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday). One of the study questions was related to the number of times the professional either took work home or stayed after normal business hours to get work done, while the other asked about the number of nights the professional was out of town for work-related travel. The number of times a professional either took work home or stayed beyond normal hours was reported as an average of 3.9 nights per month. The two groups with the greatest number of reported extra work instances were Extension educators, 6.3 nights per month, and program coordinators, 4.6 hours per month.

On average, Stark (2008) found that a 4-H youth development professional is out of town 11.7 nights per year. This figure increases significantly with Extension educators, who reported they were out of town an average of 21.0 nights per year, and program coordinators, who reported an average of 14.1 nights per year.

Another study conducted at the University of Idaho by Church and Pals (1982) investigated the reasons Extension professionals leave the profession. The factors that influenced Extension professionals to stay or leave their jobs included the chance for advancement and promotion, evening and weekend work, and salary. The majority of the 4-H youth development professionals who left reported that the evening and weekend work was the reason they left.

Workload for Other Human Service Professions

In September 2006, the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (2007) contracted with Walter R. McDonald and Associates, in cooperation with the American Humane Association, for a comprehensive workload study of all workers in Children's Administration (CA) who provided services to a case. Walter R. McDonald and Associates, as well as the American Humane Association, are both organizations that are nationally known for child welfare workload analysis.

According to the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (2007), the goals of the workload study were to identify and understand the (a) required responsibilities of the child-welfare worker, clerical staff, and infrastructure support for staff in fulfilling their duties; (b) time and staff needed to complete all responsibilities; (c) estimated time required to engage in child-welfare practices that can be considered basic practices; and (d) tools and skills necessary for CA to continuously reassess workloads

based on shifts in the factors that influence the provision of child-welfare services. The primary findings of the study presented the difference between *what is* and *is needed* to fulfill current policies, regulations, and basic practice standards. The findings were measured in staff hours, case hours, and the number of FTEs needed in both the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) and the Division of Licensing Resources (DLR).

To determine the time the staff members invested in their jobs, the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (2007) created a task inventory. The inventory included categories that were used as a framework for staff members to document the standards estimating how much time was spent on each job activity.

The first phase of the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (2007) workload study included defining workload categories conducted by CA staff through the development of a task inventory. The task inventory categories were then used as the framework to document the time staff members devoted to each activity. The results of the time study provided a basis upon which experienced CA staff was asked to construct standards for the time it should take to provide consistent services to children and families. The constructed standards were then utilized in a staff allocation model process that resulted in determining the number of FTEs required. The final phase of the project involved the analysis and development of recommendations for further study and consideration by the CA.

As indicated by the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (2007), a workload study was not the same as conducting a budget study, creating a strategic plan or efficiency report, or determining the work processes or quality assurance. A workload study can support each portion of a workplace and is a tool to understand how

staff members utilize their time, from division-wide requirements to task-level job responsibilities completed by individual staff members.

Suggestions made in the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (2007) report included conducting regular workload studies; working with court staff to reduce delays; finding a way to either improve or a new technology to use in data processing; prioritizing face-to-face contacts; finding new approaches for tasks, such as client transportation and supervised visits, to free up social workers' time for other tasks; reviewing the meeting commitments; and developing new methods of overseeing caseloads. The authors found that social workers, in managing cases, spent almost half of their time on tasks not involving contact with families and other clientele. Some of these administrative-type tasks had become the social workers' responsibility due to cuts in support staff.

Many of the recommendations made for the social workers were to address issues similar to the challenges facing Extension 4-H youth development professionals. One of the reasons the Washington CA chose to do the workload study was to determine the size of the gap between *what is* and *what should be*.

Professional Burnout

Graham (1997) said:

> to work in Extension you must be a speaker, a marketer, a writer, a magician, a typist, an educator, a programmer, a budgeter, a manager, an evaluator, a planner, a trainer, an implementer, an innovator, a chaperone, a leader, an organizer, involved in the community, creative, energetic, flexible, effective, trilingual (English,

> Spanish and computers), a resource developer, a wolf, a bulldog, a study and a team player. (para. 3)

While the quotation was an exaggeration of what the workload was for an Extension professional, according to Kutilek et al. (2002), there have been multiple studies where Extension professionals have identified work/life challenges including workload, time control/balance, and personal attitude/expectations. When these same professionals were asked to identify the greatest influence on the number of hours they work for Extension, the top three items selected were self, clientele, and immediate supervisor.

Farber (1983) found that burned-out professionals tend to be either absent or late for work more frequently than non-burned-out professionals. They are also visibly less optimistic and more rigid. The professionals' performance at work weakens, and they are likely to either daydream or to actually plan on leaving the profession. Barrick (1989) reported that individuals who are burned out are not lazy or underachievers as they are often identified. They are often overachievers, dynamic, charismatic, empathetic, dedicated, idealistic, and people-oriented.

Extension professionals are known for their "helping" manner which, according to Igodan and Newcomb (1986), means they often must interact with clientele in various roles, in addition to completing their administrative duties which may include sizeable amounts of paperwork, telephone calls, and dealing with the increasing demands of both the clientele and the institution for which they work. Based on these demands and the pressures they can cause, the Extension professionals often feel that both physical and emotional exhaustion lead to the burnout.

Definition of Burnout

Croom (2003) referenced Herbert Freudenberger, a psychologist practicing in New York in the 1960s and 1970s. Freudenberger was one of the first researchers in the area of burnout and was the first to use the term *burnout* to describe the effects of being overworked, frustrated, and exhausted, during his time operating a free clinic for drug users and indigent persons. Burnout was defined as "chronic exhaustion and frustration resulting from continued devotion to a goal or principle that has failed to produce a corresponding reward" (p. 1). Croom also referenced Maslach, who defined burnout as "a condition characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and loss of a sense of personal accomplishment" (p. 3). This condition was found in people involved in human service occupations, such as education, social work, police, and emergency services. According to the article by Croom (2003), burnout can appear when the following conditions are present: work overload, lack of control over one's work environment, lack of community among co-workers, lack of fairness in work assignments, and the uneven distribution or absence of rewards.

Maslach and Jackson (1981) suggested that burnout can lead to a decline in the quality of care or service performed by the professional and that burnout is a factor in job turnover, absenteeism, and low morale. The Maslach Burnout Inventory was designed to measure burnout in professionals related to four categories: emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, depersonalization, and involvement. Many studies that have used this instrument have found that burnout is related to the desire to leave one's job.

Burnout in Extension

Igodan and Newcomb (1986) conducted a survey with a stratified, random sample of 241 Ohio Extension agents to determine the extent to which the agents experienced burnout. The majority experienced a low level of burnout. A significant minority (12%), however, experienced high levels. As a group, 4-H agents experienced burnout more often than other types of Extension professionals, followed by young agents and single agents. Agents who were satisfied with their jobs did not have much of a problem with burnout, but this study showed that, as job satisfaction decreased, burnout increased.

Igodan and Newcomb (1986) identified the typical burned-out agent profile as young (between 20 and 30 years of age) agents who were more likely to be single than married, and were both male and female. They tended to be more involved in job responsibilities related to 4-H youth development as opposed to agriculture or family and consumer science, although agriculture agents and 4-H agents had a similar self-reported workload. This study indicated that, as workload for an individual increased, the typical agent experienced greater levels of burnout. Based on the results of the Igodan and Newcomb study, Extension agents, particularly young, single 4-H agents who are experiencing job dissatisfaction, must be alert to the symptoms of burnout. One suggestion from Igodan and Newcomb was that agents should take time to develop a suitable array of coping strategies to dissipate the stress that can lead to strain and, hence, burnout.

Turnover and Burnout in Extension

High employee turnover can be a result of burnout. Reasons cited by Strong and Harder (2009) for turnover included low salaries, downsizing, and an increased workload. The author stated that turnover may cost an organization up to 150% of the employee's

salary to hire a replacement when one leaves a job. Another example was from Kutilek (2000) who said a state Extension program may pay an estimated net cost of $80,000 per employee who leaves his or her employment.

Strong and Harder (2009) reviewed several studies and found many common factors that contribute to an Extension professional's decision to leave the organization. One factor was the salary received in relationship to the work Extension professionals are expected to perform (Clark, 1992; Herbert & Kotrlik, 1990; Kutilek, 2000; Riggs & Beus, 1993; Tilburg, 1988). Strong and Harder (2009) said that Kentucky Extension professionals cited low pay as a key factor in their decision to leave. There is a trend of over-commitment, continuous multi-tasking, and working late hours among Extension professionals. These reasons contribute to job stress and increased turnover. Budget cuts result in personnel cuts, meaning the workload keeps increasing for those who are already overloaded.

According to Rousan and Henderson (1996), another reason Extension professionals gave for leaving their jobs was the long and abnormal hours, including nights and weekends, expected of them. Strong and Harder (2009) also conveyed that many Extension professionals find that the work hours make it difficult to balance their work and family lives.

Rousan and Henderson (1996) studied personnel who resigned from one state Extension system and the reasons why they left. Between January 1, 1990, and December 31, 1994, Ohio State University Extension had 64 county Extension professionals voluntarily leave the organization. Of those who left, 49% were 4-H youth development professionals. Based on the study of exit surveys, Rousan and Henderson (1996) found that

organizational factors, such as insufficient pay for the amount of work performed, too many work responsibilities, and lack of recognition, were the items that received the greatest number of responses of *definitely* and *great extent* as the reasons why a person chose to leave. As for the individual work-related factors, those that received the greatest number of *definitely* or *great extent* included other priorities in life, too many late-night meetings, and conflicts between organizational values and personal values. A third category of factors included individual non-work-related factors. Those non-work related factors receiving the greatest number of *definitely* and *great extent* responses were another job offer, family obligations, work conflicting with personal responsibilities, and not enough time for developing and/or maintaining personal relationships.

A study of North Carolina Cooperative Extension county program professionals (Safrit, Gliem, Gliem, Owen, & Sykes, 2009) found that individuals with 4-H youth development program responsibilities have more ongoing challenges regarding turnover and burnout. The 4-H job responsibilities are more diverse and demanding, and require more evening and weekend commitments. Safrit et al. stated that it was important for administrators to understand the level of commitment required by 4-H and to recognize the differences between 4-H youth development responsibilities and other Extension professionals' responsibilities.

Burnout in Agricultural Education Professionals

Just as study results indicate that Extension professionals experienced burnout with an increased workload, there have been studies showing the workload and burnout of agriculture teachers. Croom (2003) stated that the teaching profession was a visible profession in the world, and even though significant improvements have been made in

student achievement, society continues to expect more from its teachers. The job of an agricultural education instructor is both demanding and challenging. These teachers must draw upon physical, emotional, and intellectual resources in order to be effective in the classroom. Teachers often find themselves working well beyond the typical 40-hour week as they supervise student projects, coach career development teams, evaluate student work, and prepare lessons. According to a report from Moore (2008), agricultural education instructors work about 55 hours per week.

According to Croom (2003), the daily job demands placed on teachers were major causes of unrelieved stress which resulted in teachers leaving the profession prematurely. Boone (2003) found that a greater percentage of agricultural education teachers departed by the end of their third full year of teaching. Much of this turnover was attributed to stress, heavy workload, and the constant pressure to improve student performance. Croom (2003) reported that the Metropolitan Life Corporation found that nearly 30% of teachers believed their opinions did not matter to school administrators. Teachers desired to have an impact in the classroom, and the risk of burnout escalated when too many non-instructional duties and an overload of responsibilities were the norm.

Croom (2003) completed a study of 248 agricultural education instructors from three states in the southeastern United States. Croom used the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educator's Survey as the instrument to determine the respondents' frequency of burnout. The study found that burnout was not a serious problem for agriculture teachers. While there were indications that teachers were experiencing some stress, the stress levels had not reached the point where burnout was a problem. Conclusions drawn from this study regarding teacher burnout in agricultural education were:

- Agricultural education instructors experience moderate levels of emotional exhaustion in their work.
- Agricultural education instructors experience low levels of depersonalization in relationships with students, colleagues, and others.
- Agricultural education instructors experience a high degree of personal accomplishment in their work.
- An agriculture teacher's gender, academic degree, field preparation method, and annual contract length do not seem to influence teachers' responses on each of the sub-scales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory.
- The age and years of teaching experience of the agriculture teacher is related to depersonalization scores on the Maslach Burnout Inventory. As teachers get older and more experienced, they may develop coping skills to alleviate the tendency to treat students in an impersonal manner.
- The age of the agriculture teacher and the years of teaching experience are not related to emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment scores on the Maslach Burnout Inventory. (p. 11)

Croom (2003) also stated that some implications drawn from this study are related to teacher recruitment, teacher training, and issues beyond agricultural education. In teacher recruitment, it is important to let potential teachers know the perception that agricultural education instructors have an increased burnout rate is not accurate. The reality is that teachers have a high degree of satisfaction with their accomplishments, and burnout is not a major problem for those teachers who stay in the profession and develop coping mechanisms. During teacher preparation courses, it is important to inform students about

the potential for burnout in the profession, to make suggestions, and to teach the skills needed to cope with the stress. The student-teaching experience is the perfect time to address these issues. It is also important to encourage a sense of community within the school setting and to work with fellow educators in other disciplines to encourage communication and supportive attitudes among teachers and administrators.

In a study of vocational supervisors in Ohio conducted by Barrick (1989), it was found that, as job satisfaction increased, the burnout of those supervisors decreased. For some agricultural education instructors or those who worked in vocational programs, an increased workload decreased their job satisfaction and increased burnout (Flowers & Pepple, 1988).

Burnout in Other Professions

Similar to career professionals in Extension and teaching, people who work for non-profit agencies have suffered job burnout. Preston (2007) found that 70% of the younger workers in non-profit organizations neither saw themselves as the executive director of a charity nor did they have the desire for that title. In fact, the same survey found that 45% of respondents did not believe their next job would be for a charity/non-profit organization. These workers, whose mean age was 28, were experiencing burnout. They felt not well compensated and indicated they would be leaving the non-profit workforce.

Burnout affects everyone at some point, but in the human service fields, there seems to be a higher burnout rate. In a study (Bennett, Plint, & Clifford, 2005) of hospital-based child protection professionals in Canada, it was found that 34% of those professionals showed signs of burnout, which was defined in this particular study as high

levels of emotional exhaustion and/or high levels of cynicism and/or low levels of professional efficacy. A significant number of those people reporting burnout were front-line workers such as social workers and psychologists. The reported job-related stresses that contributed to burnout included conflicting demands on time, large overall volume of work, too few staff members to do the job, work/life balance with too much time spent at work, becoming involved in the emotional distress of their patients, and not knowing where future funding will come from for their unit/program.

Increasing numbers of employees who started as qualified, energetic, and productive reported becoming burned out, and according to Jackson and Schuler (1983), the number of employees who become burned out will continue to increase unless action is taken to determine burnouts' causes and how to prevent it. Employee burnout is a psychological process, a series of attitudinal and emotional reactions caused by job-related and personal experiences. Individuals who enter the human services field tend to experience burnout because of a gap between the expectations they have for the profession when they first enter the field and the realities of the profession. Table 3 shows the causes and consequences of employee burnout based on the work of Jackson and Schuler.

University faculty members face burnout and work stress on a regular basis. Daly and Dee (2006) described heavy teaching loads, the pressure to conduct research, and expectations to perform service to the profession and/or university as issues faculty members confront on a regular basis. Based on the expectancy theory, the decision to leave or stay with an organization can be attributed to relationships between structural, psychological, and environmental variables. Maslach (as cited by Croom, 2002), identified three variables of burnout: (a) emotional exhaustion, (b) depersonalization, and (c) loss of a

sense of personal accomplishment. Daly and Dee (2006) defined structural variables as communication, equitable rewards, work autonomy, job security, and roles in decision making. It is the acceptance of the structures that affects the psychological factors, which are all influenced by the environmental factors. Based on the expectancy theory, when the expectations of the variables are met, job satisfaction and work commitment are higher.

Table 3. Causes and Consequences of Employee Burnout

Causes	Psychological Reactions	Consequences
Organizational Conditions	Emotional exhaustion	Withdrawal
Lack of rewards		
Lack of control		
Lack of clarity	Depersonalization	Interpersonal friction
Lack of support		
		Declining performance
Personal Conditions	Low personal accomplishment	
Idealistic expectations		Family problems
Personal responsibility		Health suffers

Note. Adapted from Jackson & Schuler (1983)

Mor Barak, Levin, Nissly, and Lane (2006) conducted a study to determine what factors determine whether child-welfare workers stay on the job or leave. They found that stress was one indicator of the intent to leave. They also found larger workloads as a reason for turnover. A lack of job satisfaction and high stress were strong predictors of an employee's intent to leave the organization. It was found that job stress was related to the fact that there was too much work and not enough time to complete it.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been defined many different ways. Hoppcock (1935) defined job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental

circumstances that cause workers to say they are satisfied with their job. Petty, Brewer, and Brown (2005) discussed Brayfields' definition of job satisfaction which was "a feeling or affective state that employees had towards their job" (p. 59). Spector (1985) defined job satisfaction as "an emotional affective response to a job or specific aspect of a job" (p. 695). Over the years, job satisfaction was defined both by overall job satisfaction as well as by varying factors which can affect one's job satisfaction (Petty et al., 2005).

According to Long and Swortzel (2007), U.S. job satisfaction levels have been on a steady decline since 1995 and hit an all time low in 2003. Cano and Miller (1992) found that workers have been steadily growing unhappier with their jobs due to the technological changes in the workplace and the accelerated pace of activities. A person's work experiences have an effect on the individual employee and on society. Job satisfaction affects employee decision making on a daily basis, including whether employees go to work each day or quit their jobs all together.

According to the Motivator-Hygiene Theory, as introduced by Herzberg (as cited in Petty et al., 2005), many jobs have factors that lead to either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Castillo and Cano (1999) stated that motivating factors which lead to satisfaction include achievement of the work itself, recognition, responsibilities, and advancement. These factors help individuals achieve their psychological potential. Those factors that lead to dissatisfaction are related to the work environment, including pay, working conditions, supervision, policies, and interpersonal relationships.

Jewell, Beavers, Kirby, and Flowers (1990) reported that there was a relationship between turnover (or occupational change) and job satisfaction. Several studies investigated employee satisfaction (factors such as productivity, performance, and

absenteeism) and job turnover. These studies, conducted in the 1970s (Bartol, 1979; Baum & Youngblood, 1975; Porter & Steers, 1973), reported a low, but positive and consistent, correlation between job dissatisfaction and job turnover. Another researcher, Carrell (1976), discussed the importance of the relationship between satisfaction and training, absenteeism, and turnovers.

Salary, benefits, job security, and the ability to retire are reasons individuals gave for remaining in a job (Borzaga, 2006; Long & Swortzel, 2007). Management actions affect employee satisfaction both positively and negatively. It has been suggested that administrators conduct periodic needs assessments to determine the level of job satisfaction of personnel and to identify methods for increasing satisfaction (Borzaga, 2006; Long & Swortzel, 2007; Mallilo, 1990).

According to Frauenheim (2006), the increasing cost of replacing employees has placed increased importance on retaining employees. The cost of replacing an employee is estimated at 27% of a person's annual salary. The quality of coworker and/or customer relationships is one of the primary employee considerations in deciding to accept or leave a job, along with work/life balance opportunities and agreeing with the purpose/mission of the organization. All of these factors are related to satisfaction with a job.

Frauenheim (2006) found that the number of employees who plan on looking for a new job within 3 months was 65%. Thirty-eight percent of employees, up 50% in one year's time, described themselves as "very likely" to leave their current job according to the same survey. Another study, conducted by MetLife (as cited by Frauenheim, 2006), had similar results of employees changing jobs over an 18-month period, which in 2003 was 16%; in 2004, the number was 17%, and in 2005, the number of employees changing jobs

increased to 22%. The percentage of employees who changed jobs was 14% in families with children under the age of 6 in 2003; in 2004 and 2005, the number was 26% and 31%, respectively.

Petty et al. (2005) found that the years of service to an organization or company affected an employee's level of job satisfaction. Employees with 3-7 years of service tended to have a lower job satisfaction than other employees.

According to the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986), half of teachers leave the profession within the first 7 years. Castillo and Cano (1999) also found that the rate of turnover was a consistent measure related to job satisfaction. Turnover can impact an organization for the following reasons: (a) increasing costs related to recruiting, selecting, and training new employees; (b) reducing the morale of employees who remain with the organization; (c) reducing relationships among employees; (d) projecting an unfavorable image to those who remain informed about the organization; (e) interrupting daily activities; and (f) by diminishing the opportunity for the organization to grow.

Job Satisfaction and Extension Professionals

The Cooperative Extension System as a whole deals with issues of job satisfaction and retention on a regular basis. Bartholomew and Smith (1990) concluded that job satisfaction is an indicator of an employee's performance and may also be significant in the overall effectiveness of the organization. In 1990, Mallilo conducted a needs assessment to determine job satisfaction among the Rhode Island Cooperative Extension personnel, using the Brayfield and Roth Job Satisfaction Index (1951) to obtain the level of job satisfaction for all 24 Rhode Island Extension employees. The overall index of job satisfaction was identified as the mean score obtained from the 20-item questionnaire.

Mallilo (1990) reported that a mean score of 68.3 (out of 90) suggested a moderate to high satisfaction with Extension employment. Comments by the professionals in this study indicated that professionals felt their jobs were usually interesting or at least more interesting than other jobs as well as, for the most part, enjoyable.

Mallilo (1990) stated that the one negative job satisfaction index item identified by more than 81% of the Rhode Island Extension professionals was salary. They did not feel they were adequately compensated for their work.

Bowen, Radhakrishna, and Keyser (1994) conducted a study of a stratified, random sample of National Association of Extension 4-H Agents members to examine the relationship among job satisfaction, organizational commitment, family structure, and work characteristics. One of the key findings showed how agents who were satisfied with their jobs were also committed to the organization. The authors also determined that an agent's job satisfaction was significantly related to age, gender, marital status, and work experience. Those agents who were female, older (over 40 years of age), married, and had experience were more satisfied than those who were male, younger, single, and less experienced. Essentially, this study found that 4-H agents were generally satisfied with their jobs and were committed to Cooperative Extension, but the results also concluded that organizational commitment is dependent on job satisfaction, and vice versa, so that one cannot exist without the other. The authors also concluded that the agents who were younger, single, and had less experience may still be deciding what they want to do for a career, which may affect their satisfaction with the job and their commitment to the organization.

A study by N. G. Smith (1980) examined Maryland Cooperative Extension Service professionals and demonstrated that older professionals have higher job-satisfaction levels than younger professionals. People working in 4-H youth development had a lower level of job satisfaction than other Extension professionals.

For many Extension professionals, job satisfaction is not necessarily tied to actual job responsibilities, but to their colleagues and the Cooperative Extension Service as an organization. Gliem and Gliem (2001) found that, with Ohio State University College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Science professionals, involvement in decision making is extremely important for job satisfaction. When the college did not provide sufficient communication about policies and decisions that affect people's jobs and job responsibilities, the level of job satisfaction decreased. The authors concluded that, when supervisors continually demonstrate that their employees are needed, valued, and appreciated, employees will have higher levels of job satisfaction. It was also reported that, as the age of the employee increased, so did the level of job satisfaction.

Riggs and Beus (1993) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and the coping strategies Extension professionals use to deal with stressful work-related situations. The authors found that Extension professionals have a moderately high satisfaction rate for their jobs, colleagues, and CES (or Cooperative Extension System), but the satisfaction with colleagues and CES as an organization was higher. Those professionals who utilize colleagues and resources besides their family or themselves to cope with job-related stress are more satisfied with CES as an organization. A significant relationship between gender and job responsibilities when determining job satisfaction was also identified. Female Extension professionals who increased their job responsibilities

found their job satisfaction increased, but the opposite was true for male Extension professionals. Extension professionals need to be aware of factors related to job satisfaction, including attitudes towards the organization and colleagues, and to understand that a reduction in any one factor may lead to reduced job satisfaction. Extension professionals who are unable to cope with stressful situations at work will have lower job satisfaction.

According to Kersey (1998), youth development professionals employed full time by the state of Florida reported a greater job satisfaction when it related to the intrinsic factors of their job, rather than the extrinsic factors. Kersey found several factors that lead to job dissatisfaction: (a) lack of time to spend with family, (b) a lack of leadership and vision in the organization, and (c) low levels of commitment.

Balancing work and family is a continual struggle for Extension personnel (Fetsch & Kennington, 1997). Extension work regularly requires long hours, including nights and weekends. Extension professionals often find themselves in conflict among the demands on their time and energy by clientele, administrators' expectations, family expectations, and family priorities. The expectation to work extra nights and weekends seems to be more prevalent with personnel who are single (Babkirk & Davis, 1982). Hawkins (1982) found that, when there are problems at home, there tend to be more problems at work. A professional's family is a great resource to help maintain quality work (Hawkins, 1982).

Place, Jacob, Summerhill, and Arrington (2000) found that, when Extension professionals have the ability to manage their time more effectively, it helps reduce stress levels, increasing job satisfaction. Stress levels increase when professionals are over-

committed, work late, constantly multi-task, and feel like they are always on the go. By decreasing these factors, the level of job satisfaction increases, and burnout decreases.

Fetsch and Kennington (1997) explained that, in times of uncertain funding, Extension professionals are increasingly pressured to do more with less. This stressor affects job satisfaction and is often a determining factor in whether an employee decides to continue with the job.

According to de los Santos and Not-land (1994), the Dominican Republic's Agricultural Extension Service (similar to the United States' Cooperative Extension System) had problems with absenteeism, turnover, and job satisfaction. Factors contributing to these problems were the lack of organizational structure and financial resources. The turnover rate for the Dominican Republic was exceptionally high, which led to an unstable and erratic system for both the organization and the clientele. These factors led to a lack of job satisfaction for individuals remaining with the organization, exacerbating the turnover.

Job Satisfaction and Agricultural Education Professionals

The growing teacher shortage in the past 20 years has resulted in more research being conducted to determine the job satisfaction of secondary agricultural education teachers. Studies by Chapman and Green (1986) and Chase (1986) found a feeling of disenchantment and burnout which was caused by stress, low salaries, increased teacher loads, a reduction in work force, the lack of involvement in program planning, and other factors.

To establish the level of job satisfaction related to personality type, a study of West Virginia secondary agriculture teachers was conducted by Watson and Hillison (1991). The

study found that teachers were generally satisfied with the intrinsic factors of their job (e.g., creativity, social service, and independence), but the level of job satisfaction was lower when the extrinsic factors were measured. Specifically, there was a lower satisfaction when related to school policy and practices, advancement, compensation, and supervisor competence.

Large numbers of beginning teachers leave teaching after a short period of time according to Jewell et al. (1990). In North Carolina between 1980 and 1985, 64% of agricultural education teachers who left the profession did so to change occupations. In this study of agricultural education teachers, the authors determined that there was relationship between job satisfaction and the work environment, similar to 4-H youth development professionals. Training teachers is very costly, and losses to the profession may be avoidable if there were a better understanding of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

A report published by Greiner and Smith (2006) cited the National Center for Education Statistics which found that, nationwide, 9.3% of public school teachers leave before the end of their first year in the classroom. Within the first three years of teaching, more than one-fifth of public school teachers leave their positions. The report found that 50% of beginning teachers exit the teaching profession within their first five years of service.

Voke (2002) stated that teacher turnover is problematic for two reasons. The first reason is the cost of hiring new teachers. School district are forced to spend more time and money on recruiting candidates to fill the vacant positions. Second, once the new teacher is hired, the school districts must, again, devote time and money to develop the competencies of the new teachers, only to have them leave after just a few years.

According to Voke (2002), another downfall of teacher turnover, just as with Cooperative Extension, is when school reform or change needs to take place. It is difficult to get new teachers to accept the reform because of their unfamiliarity with the need for change. They may have a lack of commitment to the reform or change due to their inexperience.

Why are so many teachers leaving the profession? Common reasons given by Voke (2002) are retirement and school-staffing cutbacks, along with personal and family matters, as well as job dissatisfaction. In fact, these reasons are often stated frequently. Voke reported that 42% of teachers who leave the profession say it is because of job dissatisfaction or the desire to pursue a better job, to commence another career, or to improve career opportunities. Voke found that those who report leaving due to job dissatisfaction often cite low salaries, lack of support from school administration, lack of student motivation, student discipline problems, and lack of teacher influence with decision making as factors influencing their decisions. There were also times when the wrong individuals were being recruited for the job. A. Smith and Day (2008) explained that some novice teachers enter the profession because they think it would be great to have their summers off, want to be a coach, or were former agriculture students who wanted to keep reliving those memories. Entering a profession to relive the past often leads to job dissatisfaction because personnel discover they do not enjoy teaching others.

A study of Ohio secondary agriculture teachers was conducted by Cano and Miller (1992) to determine actual job satisfaction and dissatisfaction factors. The five job satisfiers ranked highest were achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and the work itself. The factors that caused job dissatisfaction were interpersonal relationships,

policy and administration, salary, supervision/technical, and the working conditions. The researchers found that, overall, Ohio agriculture teachers were satisfied with their jobs. As the years of experience increased, so did the job satisfaction.

Walker, Garton, and Kitchel (2004) explained that turnover can be costly to organizations. It can be more cost effective for a school to work on retaining its current teachers rather than trying to hire new ones. It is important to know what factors are associated with teacher turnover and retention. Understanding the factors is one of the first steps in creating teacher-retention strategies.

In a report by Near, Rice, and Hunt (1978), job satisfaction was greatest among respondents who had held their jobs the longest and lowest among respondents who had held their jobs for the shortest period of time. This finding was similar to studies of job satisfaction with Extension professionals. The authors also found that work-related variables were significantly associated with both job satisfaction and health, but not with measures of life satisfaction.

Bruening and Hoover (1991) indicated that life factors have an impact on job satisfaction and effectiveness in agricultural education teachers. In the study of U.S. secondary agricultural education teachers, it was found that personal life factors have both positive and negative effects on teachers' performance. Financial rewards were considered a negative factor while teaching fulfillment was the highest positive factor. The authors confirmed that, when determining the satisfaction of secondary agriculture teachers, the fulfillment and satisfaction they receive from teaching must also be clarified.

Family factors have an influence on one's job satisfaction (Odell, Cochran, Lawrence, & Gartin, 1990). This study identified items that had a greater level of effect on

job satisfaction for members from the Northeast region of the National Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, including years teaching, income level, and the number of hours worked per week. Job satisfaction was greater for teachers with a higher income and more years of service. Teachers who work more hours in a week had lower job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction and Other Professions

Job satisfaction can have an influence on a person's job and career as well as affect all aspects of a person's life, as described by Wright, Bennett, and Dun's (1999) study of professional card dealers from Nevada. There was a small correlation between life satisfaction and card dealers' satisfaction with pay ($r = .33$, $p < .01$); a positive correlation existed between an increase in pay and job satisfaction. The researchers concluded that a person's salary was one reason for low job satisfaction, but when low pay was coupled with additional factors, such as distancing oneself from co-workers, supervision, and limited opportunities for advancement, it could lead to employee burnout.

Not every profession has a low job-satisfaction rate. For people who work in the human service/non-profit field, there tends to be a greater level of job satisfaction (Borzaga, 2006; Petty et al., 2005). In the Petty et al. (2005) study of employees from various youth development organizations, overall job satisfaction was reported as high, but the individual factors related to job satisfaction were not studied. One recommendation from the researchers was to use the Spector Job Satisfaction Survey to see if there is a difference between overall job satisfaction and individual job satisfaction factors.

Like the teaching profession, medicine will see a significant shortage of qualified nurses in the future (Wagner, 2006). Wagner estimated that, by 2020, there would be a

29% vacancy rate in the nursing profession. In a study of 550 nurses from around the country, it was found that 85% of those who were highly engaged in the workplace did not have any plans to leave their current position or the profession within the next 12 months. This number decreased to 42% for nurses who were disengaged.

Summary

Over the past 25 years, there has been an increase in research on burnout and job satisfaction. Burnout is a serious issue that can lead to decreased productivity for the employee and increased costs for the employer. Finding the connections among burnout, job satisfaction, and work environment is important to help eliminate problems. A serious negative includes work overload (Barrick, 1989). Based on the previous research about workload, burnout, and job satisfaction, 4-H youth development professionals are prime candidates for experiencing low job satisfaction and high burnout, which may lead to professionals leaving the organization early.

Several factors related to workload, job satisfaction, and burnout have been explored in this chapter. The literature review included an evaluation of the 4-H PRKC and how these competencies are related to daily job tasks performed by 4-H youth development professionals. The chapter demonstrated how the 4-H PRKC has been used throughout the United States in the 4-H youth development profession.

The workload for individuals who work with youth, whether they are 4-H youth development professionals, agricultural education instructors, or child-welfare workers, is heavy, and it is a factor in job turnover and burnout of professionals. Rousan and Henderson (1996) described that Extension employees have reported irregular work schedules as a reason for leaving their jobs.

Overtime hours, whether compensated or uncompensated, can lead to burnout. Emotional exhaustion is another sign of burnout (Bennett et al., 2005; Croom, 2002; Igodan & Newcomb, 1986). Another sign of burnout is physical and mental exhaustion (Igodan & Newcomb, 1986).

There is a relationship between job turnover and job satisfaction (Bartol, 1979; Baum & Youngblood, 1975; Jewell et al., 1990; Porter & Steers, 1973). The costs to replace employees continue to increase; the estimated cost of replacing an employee is at least 27% of the employee's salary (Frauenheim, 2006).

CHAPTER THREE. METHODOLOGY

This disquisition began with Chapter One, the Introduction, which described the problem being proposed and why the study was important to add to the existing research about 4-H youth development and the Cooperative Extension System. Chapter Two was a review of related literature and research which support the theoretical base for the 4-H PRKC, workloads for youth-serving professionals, Professional Burnout, and Job Satisfaction. This chapter defines the Methodology used in the study, including the Population Selection, Instrumentation, Data Collection, and analysis of the data.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. Based on the 4-H PRKC domains, how do 4-H youth development professionals rank the associated job responsibilities?
2. Is there a correlation between workload and job satisfaction of 4-H youth development professionals, and what is the correlation?
3. What is the correlation between workload and burnout in Extension 4-H youth development professionals?

Population Selection

The population for this study was Extension professionals from the University of Idaho Extension, Washington State University Extension, Colorado State University Extension, Montana State University Extension, the University of Wyoming Extension, and Oregon State University Extension, all of which are 1862 land-grant universities. The potential participants were comprised of state- and county-based professionals, including Extension Educators, 4-H program coordinators, 4-H program assistants, and others (e.g.,

office staff who also have a 4-H appointment). Table 4 is a summary of the 4-H youth development professionals who were invited to participate from each land-grant university and the number of actual participants. These are categorized by county-level and state-level professionals, including the response rate for each land-grant university. A total of 448 potential county-level 4-H youth development professionals were invited to participate in the study, and 222 completed the survey, yielding a 49.6% response rate. A total of 55 state-level professionals were invited to participate, with 29 completing the survey for a response rate of 52.7%. Complete demographic information is in Appendix D.

Table 4. Potential and Actual County-Based and State-Based Participants from Six Land-Grant University Extension Programs

State	Potential Professionals Eligible to Participate	Actual Professionals Who Participated	Actual Response Rate Percentage
County-Based Professionals			
Idaho	67	53	79.1%
Oregon	84	36	42.8%
Washington	123	36	29.3%
Montana	74	43	58.1%
Colorado	73	39	50.7%
Wyoming	27	15	55.6%
TOTAL	**448**	**222**	**49.6%**
State-Based Professionals			
Idaho	6	5	83.3%
Oregon	14	7	50.0%
Washington	16	5	31.3%
Montana	7	5	71.4%
Colorado	7	7	100.0%
Wyoming	4	0	0.0%
TOTAL	**54**	**29**	**52.7%**

Colorado State University (2010); Montana State University (2010); Oregon State University (2010); University of Idaho (2010); University of Wyoming (2010); Washington State University (2010).

Table 5 shows the number of potential participants and the actual number of participants by land-grant university. Based on the individual states' Extension websites,

there were 502 potential participants invited to participate. A total of 251 4-H youth development professionals completed at least a portion of the survey. The overall response rate for the study was 50%.

Table 5. Potential and Actual Total Participants from Six Land-Grant University Extension Programs

State	Potential Professionals	Actual Professionals	Actual Response Rate Percentage
Idaho	73	58	79.5%
Oregon	98	43	43.9%
Washington	139	41	29.5%
Montana	81	48	59.3%
Colorado	80	46	57.5%
Wyoming	31	15	48.4%
TOTAL	**502**	**251**	**50.0%**

Colorado State University (2010); Montana State University (2010); Oregon State University (2010); University of Idaho (2010); University of Wyoming (2010); Washington State University (2010).

Instrumentation

The researcher used the Survey Monkey online survey tool to administer the questionnaire. There were three major sections to the survey (Appendix C): workload, job satisfaction, and burnout. The workload and burnout sections were created using the literature review as a theoretical base and then modifying several existing surveys. The job-satisfaction portion of the survey utilized the Job Satisfaction Survey by Paul Spector. An in-depth explanation of each instrument is given in the following sections.

Workload Segment of the Instrument

The workload of 4-H youth development professionals was determined by evaluating their job responsibilities as established by the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC). This framework was adopted in 1985 and revised in 2004. It has become the foundation for the 4-H youth development profession

and the competencies that are needed to be a successful 4-H youth development professional. According to Stone and Rennekamp (2004), an extensive review of the PRK was conducted by the National Professional Development Task Force. The task force developed six domain working groups: one for each of the five original domains and a sixth which was charged with creating a new domain. Stone and Rennekamp described the tasks of the working groups to examine the elements of this framework. Each domain group conducted an extensive review of the "current data supporting the domain, examined current trends, reviewed internal and external contemporary documents for the interpretation of the meaning and conducted interviews with key informants" (p. 2).

Stone and Rennekamp (2004) described the four-level format of 4-H PRKC taxonomy: domain, topic, component, and competency. The six domains were as follows: youth development; youth program development; volunteerism; equity, access and opportunity; partnerships; and organizational systems. See Appendix E for the complete list of topics, components, and competencies.

Study participants were asked to determine what percentage of time they spend in each of the six domains as well as how much time they felt should be spent in each of the domains. The second part of the instrument was to determine on which job responsibilities from the 4-H PRKC competencies the 4-H youth development professionals focused. The participants were asked to rank order those job responsibilities from the one on which they spend the most time to the one on which they spend the least amount of time. Ranking was completed for each of the six domains, with seven job responsibilities in each domain.

For each of the domains and competencies (job responsibilities), the study participants were asked to reflect on their job satisfaction and burnout level, and to self-

report on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5. For job satisfaction, this scale was between a *1 extremely satisfied* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied.* For the burnout section, the scale was between *1 = to a very small degree* and *5 = to a very large degree.*

Job Satisfaction Segment of the Instrument

Spector (1985) created the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) to fulfill a need for this type of survey in the human services and non-profit field. According to Spector, the subscales were created from an extensive literature review. A list of the dimensions for job satisfaction was developed, with the nine most common used for the JSS. The JSS was created to measure the attitudinal reaction to a job, as supported by the literature. Spector used the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) as a basis, or beginning, in creating the JSS, but because the JDI was not specific to the human services field, the JSS was created.

Originally developed for use in human service organizations, Spector (1985) tested the JSS to determine the norms for a wide range of organizations in both the private and public sectors. Based on the instructions from Spector (1985), the JSS is a 36-item, 9-facet scale to assess employee attitudes about the job and aspects of the job. Each facet is assessed with four items, and a total score is computed from all items. A Likert-type scale format is used; there are six choices per item, ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree.* The nine issues related to job satisfaction are pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards (performance-based rewards), operating procedures (required rules and procedures), co-workers, nature of work, and communication.

The participants were also asked to report their overall level of job satisfaction. The job satisfaction was based on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5 with *1 = extremely satisfied* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied.*

Burnout Segment of the Instrument

The overall burnout for 4-H youth development professionals was measured in this section of the survey. After reviewing several burnout instruments (Borritz & Kristensen, 2004; Livestrong, 2010; Mind Tools, 2010; New Unionism Network, 2004) to determine question ideas and the scale to measure burnout, a 40-item questionnaire was developed to measure overall burnout. Each participant was also asked to identify his/her overall degree of burnout based on a 5-point Likert-type scale. For this scale, *1 = to a very small degree* and *5 = to a very large degree.*

Data Collection

Survey Monkey, a web-based survey tool, was used to distribute the survey to potential participants. The survey was a retrospective behavioral instrument.

The 4-H professionals from the University of Idaho, Oregon State University, Montana State University, Colorado State University, the University of Wyoming, and Washington State University received an email with a link to the survey (Appendix B). A copy of the informed consent was included as part of the survey. The research participants were given 14 days to complete the survey. A reminder email was sent at 7 and 13 days. After 14 days, there was a 40% return rate, so the survey was kept open for 7 additional days. All 4-H professionals who were invited to participate in the study were sent an email letting them know that there were 7 additional days to complete the instrument. After 6 days, another reminder email was sent. The survey was closed when a 50% response rate was achieved at 21 days.

Data Analysis

The findings of this study were reported using the mean, standard deviation, frequency percentages, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and tukey HSD (honestly significant difference), and pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The survey was administered using an online tool, and the raw data were exported into Microsoft Excel and then into PASW Statistics, version 18, for analysis.

The job responsibilities were divided into six categories based on the established domains of the 4-H PRKC. The mean, standard deviation, and frequency percentages were calculated for each job responsibility. The workload of the 4-H professional was the dependent variable, and the mean was used to determine the correlation for both job satisfaction and burnout (dependent variables).

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) has a set of guidelines about scoring. The survey includes 36 items with 9 facet subscales of pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of work, and communication. From the 36 items, a total job satisfaction score was determined.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for all sections of the survey (domain job satisfaction, domain burnout, job satisfaction survey, burnout survey, self-reported job satisfaction, and self-reported burnout). A Tukey HSD test was also conducted between each of the land-grant universities, the professional's primary job titles, and by the county Extension educator group aggregated by land-grant university. The significance for all groups was tested at the $p < .05$ level.

The Pearson-moment product correlation coefficient was used to measure the correlation between workload and job satisfaction as well as between workload and

burnout. The Pearson-moment product correlation coefficient was used to analyze the following variables for job satisfaction:

- Rank of job responsibilities
- Self-reported job satisfaction for each 4-H PRKC domain
- Self-reported job satisfaction for individual job responsibilities
- Overall Job Satisfaction Survey score
- Self-reported overall job satisfaction

For burnout, the following variables were used to determine the relationships, based on correlations.

- Rank of job responsibilities
- Self-reported burnout for each 4-H PRKC domain
- Self-reported burnout for individual job responsibilities
- Overall burnout survey score
- Self-reported overall burnout

The following definitions were used to describe the level of the relationship between variables for all correlation results. A strong relationship was determined when the correlation (either positive or negative) was between .500 and 1.00. A moderate relationship was when the correlation was between .300 and .500. A weak relationship was when the correlation was between .100 and .300. There was little to no relationship when the correlation was between .000 and .100.

The literature review confirmed a relationship between job satisfaction and burnout. Therefore, a correlation was used to determine if there was a relationship between

workload and both job satisfaction and burnout for the 4-H youth development professionals at the six land-grant universities.

Confidentiality

This study was approved by the North Dakota State University Institutional Review Board (Appendix A). The anonymity of all research participants was maintained because there were no requests for names and because the IP addresses of participants' computers were not saved in the online survey collection tool. The researcher also purchased a subscription to Survey Monkey; she was the only person with the username and password. Once the study was completed, the researcher printed the raw data which will be retained in a locked file for seven years. The online survey files will be deleted after final approval of degree completion is received from the NDSU Graduate School.

Reliability and Validity

The survey consisted of three parts. The first part of the survey had questions about workload as determined by job responsibilities, including the rank, self-reported level of job satisfaction, and burnout. The second part was the Job Satisfaction Survey questions, and the third section was the burnout survey questions. The entire survey was pilot tested by a group of experts to analyze the workload and burnout portions for content and test validity.

The expert panel was members of the 2009-2010 National Association of Extension 4-H Agents Board. Individuals who participated were the president elect, past president, two of vice presidents, and four regional directors. This group of individuals was selected to be the expert panel due to their diverse 4-H youth development job responsibilities and

the researcher's access to them. The panel of experts represented all levels of the 4-H youth development field, from state to district to county staff members.

A Cronbach's Alpha test was used to test reliability after completion of the study. The overall Cronbach's Alpha was 0.824.

CHAPTER FOUR. RESULTS

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine how Extension 4-H youth development professionals rank a set of common, predetermined job responsibilities, based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC), and to correlate that workload with job satisfaction and burnout. The study utilized quantitative methods for gathering data from Extension professionals who had job responsibilities in 4-H youth development at the University of Idaho, Montana State University, the University of Wyoming, Colorado State University, Washington State University, and Oregon State University.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. Based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (also known as the 4-H PRKC) domains, how do 4-H youth development professionals rank the associated job responsibilities?
2. Is there a correlation between workload and job satisfaction of 4-H youth development professionals, and what is the correlation?
3. What is the correlation between workload and burnout in Extension 4-H youth development professionals?

Response Rate of Survey

The overall response rate for the study was 50%. The response rate for the individual land-grant universities was as follows: (a) the University of Idaho, 79.5%; (b) Montana State University, 59.3%; (c) Colorado State University, 57.5%; (d) the University

of Wyoming, 48.4%; (e) Oregon State University, 43.9%; and (f) Washington State University, 29.5%;

4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies Workload Results

Research question one was designed to determine how 4-H youth development professionals rank a set of job responsibilities related to the 4-H PRKC. A series of questions in the survey were related to the 4-H PRKC-associated job responsibilities. The first question posed was to determine the percentage of work time that was spent on each of the six 4-H PRKC domains. Then, research participants were asked how much work time they felt should be spent in each domain, again based on a percentage. The final method to determine workload included having each research participant rank order a set of job responsibilities from the responsibility where the most work time was spent to the responsibilities where the least amount of work time was spent. There were seven job responsibilities for each of the six 4-H PRKC domains, and each domain's job responsibilities were ranked.

Table 6 illustrates the average amount of work time that 4-H youth development professionals reported spending on each of the six 4-H PRKC domains and the amount of work time that should be spent within each of the same domains, based on a percentage of time. On average, 4-H youth development professionals spend the majority of their work time within the youth program development domain. The youth program development domain was also where the respondents said they should spend the majority of their time. The 4-H youth development professionals reported spending 69.5% of their work time within the youth development, youth program development, and volunteerism domains.

The equity, access, and opportunity domain was where the least amount of time was reported, and it was ranked as the domain where the least amount of time should be spent.

Table 6. Self-Reported Percentage of Work Time Actually Spent and Where Work Time Should Be Spent for Each 4-H PRKC Domain Reported by Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals (N = 205)

Domain	Actual Percentage of Work Time Spent	Percentage of Work Time that Should Be Spent
Youth Program Development Domain	27.2%	24.8%
Youth Development Domain	21.6%	23.3%
Volunteerism Domain	20.7%	19.8%
Partnership Domain	14.2%	11.8%
Organizational Systems Domain	9.1%	10.7%
Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain	7.3%	9.6%

Rank Order Results of 4-H PRKC Domain Job Responsibilities

There were seven job responsibilities for each of the six 4-H PRKC domains. The research participants were asked to rank those individual job responsibilities from 1 to 7, with *1 = the one where the most time is spent* and *7 = the one where the least time was spent*.

Table 7 displays the overall ranking scores and percentage of frequency scores for the youth development domain. The 4-H youth development professionals ranked job responsibility #4 "creating positive relationships with youth, volunteers, families, and community partners" as the one where they spent the most time (M = 3.03, SD = 1.49). The frequency distribution for job responsibility #3 "provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas" had the greatest number of responses (f = 49.3%) with a rank score of a 1 or 2, but it had a lower ranking mean (M = 3.11, SD = 2.02), putting it below job responsibility #4 in rank order. Job responsibility #1 "participate in professional

development opportunities related to growth and development" ranked last in the youth development domain with a mean of 5.40. There were 39.2% of respondents who ranked it last in terms of the amount of time spent on it.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Rank Order of Job Responsibilities in the Youth Development Domain for Participating Youth Development Professionals

Rank Order	Job Responsibility	Ranking Descriptives			Frequency Percentages						
		N	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	4. Create positive relationships	199	3.03	1.49	18.6	19.6	27.1	18.1	10.1	5.0	1.5
2	3. Provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas	199	3.11	2.02	31.2	18.1	13.1	8.0	13.1	9.0	7.5
3	6. Develop programs to practice life skills	199	3.32	1.71	14.6	25.1	20.6	10.6	15.1	11.1	3.0
4	2. Create programs for youth	199	3.92	1.95	14.6	15.6	12.1	16.6	13.1	18.6	9.5
5	7. Deal with conflict mgmt	199	4.56	2.02	11.1	11.1	7.5	13.1	18.1	17.1	22.1
6	5. Promote positive behaviors	199	4.67	1.62	2.0	10.1	13.1	19.1	19.1	22.6	14.1
7	1. Professional. development related to growth and development	199	5.40	1.77	5.5	3.0	6.5	12.1	15.6	18.1	39.2

Note. Rank Scale: 1 = ranked first (spent the most work time); 2 = ranked second; 3 = ranked third; 4 = ranked fourth; 5 = ranked fifth; 6 = ranked sixth; and 7= ranked last (spent the least amount of work time).

Table 8 shows the results for the youth program development domain. Job responsibility #5 "selecting, developing, adapting, and/or utilizing quality youth development curricula" had the greatest frequency (M = 3.14, SD = 2.01), with 33.1% of respondents ranking it as their top choice. Job responsibility #1 "using current research and obtaining citizen perspectives to help identify program opportunities" had a mean of 5.24 (SD = 1.76), and 31.2% of the responses were a rank score of 7.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Rank Order of Job Responsibilities in the Youth Program Development Domain for Participating Youth Development Professionals

Rank Order	Job Responsibility	Rank Descriptives			Frequency Percentages						
		N	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	5. Select, develop, adapt, and/or utilize quality youth development curricula	173	3.14	2.01	33.7	9.9	17.4	12.2	8.7	10.5	7.6
2	2. Work with advisory boards	172	3.47	2.02	23.3	19.8	8.7	13.4	12.8	14.5	7.6
3	3. Identify and work with community partners	172	3.60	1.62	7.0	23.3	22.1	16.9	16.9	8.7	5.2
4	7. Work with committees or design teams to develop programs	172	3.73	2.14	19.8	15.7	16.9	11.6	9.3	8.7	18.0
5	6. Evaluate programs and communicate those results	172	4.35	1.76	4.7	14.5	14.0	20.3	15.7	17.4	13.4
6	4. Spend time planning programs and communicating those plans	172	4.60	1.83	6.4	10.5	11.6	14.5	21.5	16.3	19.2
7	1. Use research and citizen perspectives for program ideas	172	5.24	1.76	2.9	6.4	12.7	8.1	13.9	24.3	31.8

Note. Rank Scale: 1 = ranked first (spent the most work time); 2 = ranked second; 3 = ranked third; 4 = ranked fourth; 5 = ranked fifth; 6 = ranked sixth; and 7 = ranked last (spent the least amount of work time).

Table 9 reveals the results for the volunteerism domain. The job responsibility within the domain that had the greatest frequency of a 1 as the ranking score was #1 "working/using volunteer committees." The frequency was 52.5% of the respondents who ranked this job responsibility with a score of a 1 ($M = 2.26$, $SD = 1.81$). The job responsibility that ranked last with the lowest mean ($M = 5.14$, $SD = 1.60$) was #6 "writing and using written volunteer position descriptions." This job responsibility was ranked as a 7 by 24.4% of the respondents.

Table 9. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Rank Order of Job Responsibilities in the Volunteerism Domain for Participating Youth Development Professionals

Rank Order	Job Responsibility	Rank Descriptives			Frequency Percentages						
		N	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1. Use volunteer committees.	160	2.26	1.81	52.5	19.4	6.9	8.1	3.8	3.1	6.3
2	3. Provide educational opportunities for volunteers.	160	3.15	1.74	16.3	26.9	23.8	12.5	6.9	6.9	6.9
3	2. Complete a formal volunteer selection process.	160	3.93	2.03	11.3	18.8	20.6	10.0	11.3	10.6	17.5
4	7. Recruit volunteers.	160	4.33	1.89	11.3	8.8	13.8	15.0	18.1	20.0	13.1
5	5. Recognize volunteers.	160	4.34	1.47	1.3	12.5	15.6	21.3	26.9	16.3	6.3
6	4. Provide performance feedback to volunteers.	160	5.03	1.78	3.1	9.4	8.1	15.6	16.9	18.1	28.7
7	6. Use written volunteer position descriptions.	160	5.14	1.60	1.3	6.3	10.6	15.0	16.9	25.6	24.4

Note. Rank Scale: 1 = ranked first (spent the most work time); 2 = ranked second; 3 = ranked third; 4 = ranked fourth; 5 = ranked fifth; 6 = ranked sixth; and 7 = ranked last (spent the least amount of work time).

The results for the equity, access, and opportunity domain are reported in Table 10. The job responsibility that had the greatest ranking ($M = 2.30$, $SD = 1.70$) was #1 "building relationships within the community." That responsibility was ranked a 1 by 51.9% of the respondents. The job responsibility that had a mean of 5.35 ($SD = 1.87$) within the equity, access, and opportunity domain was #7 "design materials for diverse audiences." There were 40.4% of the research participants who ranked it with a score of a 7.

Table 11 shows the results for the partnership domain. Job responsibility #3 "providing opportunities for youths to lead" had a mean of 2.64 ($SD = 1.62$) with 32.0% of the respondents ranking it a 1. Job responsibility #7 "working with current boards and committees to increase youth involvement" had the greatest frequency of 4-H youth

development professionals who reported responses with a score of 7 (M = 5.35, SD = 1.71, f = 36.7%).

Table 10. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Rank Order of Job Responsibilities in the Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain for Participating Youth Development Professionals

Rank Order	Job Responsibility	Rank Descriptives			Frequency Percentages						
		N	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1. Build relationships within the community.	156	2.30	1.70	51.9	12.2	13.5	7.7	7.7	5.5	1.9
2	3. Recruit, support, and retain diverse volunteers.	156	3.78	1.78	9.6	18.6	19.9	18.6	10.9	14.7	7.7
3	6. Provide training around equity, access, and opportunity.	156	3.80	1.91	16.7	14.1	12.2	17.3	16.7	15.4	7.7
4	2. Marketing program to diverse audiences.	156	3.88	1.86	6.4	25.6	15.4	12.8	17.9	9.0	12.8
5	4. Have diverse audiences on advisory boards.	156	4.15	1.80	6.4	14.1	18.6	19.9	14.7	12.2	14.1
6	5. Make sure programs include diversity.	156	4.76	1.71	4.5	7.7	14.7	10.3	20.5	27.6	14.7
7	7. Design materials for diverse audiences.	156	5.28	1.87	1.9	11.5	7.1	12.8	10.3	16.0	40.4

Note. Rank Scale: 1 = ranked first (spent the most work time); 2 = ranked second; 3 = ranked third; 4 = ranked fourth; 5 = ranked fifth; 6 = ranked sixth; and 7= ranked last (spent the least amount of work time).

The rank-order results for the organizational management domain are reported in Table 12. Job responsibility #7 "involvement in professional association" had the greatest frequency (f = 28.3%) of being ranked as 7 (M = 4.90, SD = 1.92). There were 46.9% of the respondents who ranked their top choice (M = 2.65, SD = 2.02) in the organizational

management domain as job responsibility #1 "developing and supporting local and state policies and procedures."

Table 11. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Rank Order of Job Responsibilities in the Partnership Domain for Participating Youth Development Professionals

Rank Order	Job Responsibility	Rank Descriptives			Frequency Percentages						
		N	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	3. Provide opportunities for youth to lead.	150	2.64	1.62	32.0	22.0	19.3	12.7	8.0	2.6	3.3
2	5. Provide work-force skills to youth.	150	3.46	1.89	19.3	18.7	14.7	17.3	9.3	15.3	5.3
3	2. Advocate for youth engagement.	150	3.72	1.65	9.3	16.0	21.3	23.3	11.3	14.0	4.7
4	6. Support youth who are working on community change.	150	3.93	1.88	16.7	8.7	18.0	10.0	19.3	23.3	4.0
5	1. Facilitate youth involvement on 4-H boards and committees.	150	4.06	1.93	9.3	18.7	13.3	14.7	18.7	10.0	15.3
6	4. Involved in community coalitions.	150	5.03	1.96	6.0	9.3	10.7	7.3	16.7	16.0	34.0
7	7. Work with current boards and committees to increase youth involvement.	150	5.35	1.71	3.3	5.3	5.3	16.0	16.0	17.3	36.7

Note. Rank Scale: 1 = ranked first (spent the most work time); 2 = ranked second; 3 = ranked third; 4 ranked fourth; 5 = ranked fifth; 6 = ranked sixth; and 7= ranked last (spent the least amount of work time).

4-H PRKC Domain Job Satisfaction Results

After ranking the individual job responsibilities within the six domains, research participants were asked to self-report their level of job satisfaction for each 4-H PRKC domain. The 4-H youth development professionals used the following scale to describe

their level of job satisfaction for each domain: *1 = extremely satisfied, 2 = satisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = dissatisfied,* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied.*

Table 12. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Rank Order of Job Responsibilities in the Organizational Management Domain for Participating Youth Development Professionals

Rank	Job	Rank Descriptives			Frequency Percentages						
Order	Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1. Develop and support both local and state policy and procedures.	145	2.65	2.01	46.9	13.8	7.6	13.1	4.1	6.9	7.6
2	2. Work with media and public relations.	145	3.79	1.69	7.6	19.3	21.4	14.5	19.3	11.7	6.2
3	4. Work with volunteers and colleagues in risk management.	145	3.92	1.80	10.3	15.9	15.9	18.6	15.9	15.2	8.3
4	5. Financial management.	145	4.00	1.76	6.9	17.2	18.6	15.9	18.6	13.1	9.7
5	3. Collect and report data and enrollments.	145	4.28	1.90	7.6	14.5	13.8	18.6	15.9	11.0	18.6
6	6. Conduct research and share that research.	145	4.32	2.18	17.2	6.9	15.2	10.3	10.3	17.2	22.8
7	7. Involved in professional associations.	145	4.90	1.92	4.1	13.1	10.3	9.7	15.2	19.3	28.3

Note. Rank Scale: 1 = ranked first (spent the most work time); 2 = ranked second; 3 = ranked third; 4 = ranked fourth; 5 = ranked fifth; 6 = ranked sixth; and 7= ranked last (spent the least amount of work time).

Table 13 shows the results for the domains self-reported job-satisfaction levels. All six domain results indicated that 4-H youth development professionals were satisfied. The greatest level of job satisfaction was with the youth development domain ($M = 2.06$, $SD = 0.86$). The lowest job satisfaction was within the equity, access, and opportunity domain ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 0.85$).

The second method to measure job satisfaction was to have the research participants self-report their level of job satisfaction for the same seven job responsibilities in each of the 4-H PRKC domains. The scale for this portion of the survey was as follows: *1 = extremely satisfied, 2 = satisfied, 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 4 = dissatisfied,* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied.*

Table 13. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Self-Reported Job Satisfaction of the 4-H PRKC Domains for Participating Youth Development Professionals

	Job Satisfaction Descriptives			Frequency Percentages				
Domain	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
Youth Development Domain	202	2.06	0.86	25.2	51.5	14.9	8.4	0.0
Youth Program Development Domain	200	2.11	0.84	21.0	56.5	13.0	9.5	0.0
Volunteerism Domain	197	2.63	0.98	8.6	44.7	23.9	20.3	2.5
Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain	190	2.82	0.85	5.8	28.9	43.7	21.1	0.5
Partnership Domain	192	2.60	0.93	8.9	42.7	28.6	18.8	1.0
Organizational Management Domain	194	2.73	0.97	5.7	41.8	32.5	14.4	5.7

Note: Job Satisfaction Scale: 1 = extremely satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4 = dissatisfied; and 5 = extremely dissatisfied.

Table 14 shows the results for the youth development domain's level of job satisfaction. Job responsibility #6 "developing programs to practice life skills" had the greatest reported level of job satisfaction ($M = 1.93$, $SD = 0.72$), with 85.8% of the respondents being either extremely satisfied or satisfied. There were 26.0% of the respondents who reported dissatisfaction or extreme dissatisfaction with job responsibility #7 "dealing with conflict management." The same job responsibility had the lowest level of job satisfaction ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 0.92$) within the youth development domain.

Table 14. Descriptive Statistic Results of Job Satisfaction for Job Responsibilities in the Youth Development Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Job Satisfaction Descriptives			Frequency Percentages				
Job Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Professional development related to growth and development.	199	2.33	0.97	18.1	46.7	22.1	10.6	2.5
2. Create programs for youth.	197	2.26	0.85	18.3	44.7	29.4	7.6	0.0
3. Provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas.	195	2.04	0.86	26.7	50.3	15.9	7.2	0.0
4. Create positive relationships.	197	2.11	0.87	24.4	48.7	18.8	8.1	0.0
5. Promote positive behaviors.	195	2.58	0.78	5.6	42.6	40.5	10.8	0.5
6. Develop programs to practice life skills.	197	1.93	0.72	24.9	60.9	10.2	4.1	0.0
7. Deal with conflict mgmt.	197	2.81	0.92	3.6	40.1	30.5	23.5	2.5

Note: Job Satisfaction Scale: 1 = extremely satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4 = dissatisfied; and 5 = extremely dissatisfied.

The results for the youth program development domain are reported in Table 15. There were 68.2% of the respondents who reported job satisfaction ($M = 2.25$, $SD = 0.78$) when they selected, developed, adapted, and/or utilized quality youth development curricula (job responsibility #5). Job responsibility #6 "evaluating programs and communicating those results" had the lowest reported job satisfaction ($M = 2.91$, $SD = 0.99$). There were 30.6% of the respondents who reported being either dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied with this job responsibility.

Table 15. Descriptive Statistic Results of Job Satisfaction for Job Responsibilities in the Youth Program Development Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Job Satisfaction Descriptives			Frequency Percentages				
Job Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Use research & citizen perspectives for program ideas.	173	2.72	0.80	4.6	34.1	46.8	13.3	1.2
2. Work with advisory boards.	173	2.53	0.87	7.5	49.1	27.7	14.5	1.2
3. Identify & work with community partners.	173	2.46	0.87	12.1	41.6	34.7	11.0	0.6
4. Spend time planning programs and communicating those plans.	173	2.70	0.79	2.3	42.2	40.5	13.3	1.7
5. Select, develop, adapt, and/or utilize quality youth development curricula.	173	2.25	0.78	13.3	54.9	25.4	5.8	0.6
6. Evaluate programs and communicate those results.	173	2.91	0.99	4.6	34.7	30.1	26.0	4.6
7. Work with committees or design teams to develop programs.	173	2.45	0.80	9.2	46.8	33.5	10.4	0.0

Note. Job Satisfaction Scale: 1 = extremely satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4 = dissatisfied; and 5 = extremely dissatisfied.

Table 16 explains the results for the volunteerism domain. The job responsibility with the greatest level of job satisfaction was #1 "(using volunteer committees." The mean was 2.39 ($SD = 0.85$), and 64.4% of the respondents were either extremely satisfied or satisfied. There were 19.4% of the research participants who were either dissatisfied or

extremely dissatisfied when they provided performance feedback to volunteers (job responsibility #4). The mean for this job responsibility was 2.92 (SD = 0.77). Job responsibility #7 "recruiting volunteers" had a greater percentage (f = 26.3%) of responses reported as being either dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied (M = 2.83, SD = 0.90).

Table 16. Descriptive Statistic Results of Job Satisfaction for Job Responsibilities in the Volunteerism Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Job Satisfaction Descriptives			Frequency Percentages				
Job Responsibility	N	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Use volunteer committees.	160	2.39	0.85	10.6	53.8	21.9	13.8	0.0
2. Complete a formal volunteer selection process.	160	2.53	0.83	6.9	46.9	33.8	11.3	1.3
3. Provide educational opportunities for volunteers.	160	2.49	0.87	10.0	45.6	30.6	13.1	0.6
4. Provide performance feedback to volunteers.	160	2.92	0.77	2.5	24.4	53.8	17.5	1.9
5. Recognize volunteers.	160	2.62	0.82	6.3	40.6	38.1	15.0	0.0
6. Use written volunteer position descriptions.	160	2.76	0.87	5.6	34.4	40.6	17.5	1.9
7. Recruit volunteers.	160	2.83	0.90	4.4	35.6	33.8	25.0	1.3

Note. Job Satisfaction Scale: 1 = extremely satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4 dissatisfied; and 5 = extremely dissatisfied.

Table 17 provides the results for the equity, access, and opportunity domain job responsibilities. Building relationships with the community (job responsibility #1) had the greatest level of job satisfaction, with a mean of 2.19 (SD = 0.84), and 67.3% of the respondents reported being either extremely satisfied or satisfied with this work. There was 28.8% of the respondents who reported being either dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied (M = 2.90, SD = 0.97) when completing job responsibility #3 "recruit, support, and retain diverse volunteers)."

Table 18 contains results for the partnership domain. The greatest reported job satisfaction (M = 2.05, SD = 0.74) for the partnership domain was providing opportunities for youth to lead (job responsibility #3). There were 75.7% of the respondents who

reported being either satisfied or extremely satisfied with this job function. Job responsibility #7 "working with current boards and committees to increase youth involvement" had the lowest reported job satisfaction (M = 2.71, SD = 0.83) with 16.6% of respondents dissatisfied with the job responsibility.

Table 17. Descriptive Statistic Results of Job Satisfaction for Job Responsibilities in the Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Job Satisfaction Descriptives			Frequency Percentages				
Job Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Build relationships within the community.	156	2.19	0.84	19.9	47.4	27.6	3.8	1.3
2. Marketing program to diverse audiences.	156	2.67	0.87	7.7	35.3	40.4	15.4	1.3
3. Recruit, support, and retain diverse volunteers.	156	2.90	0.97	7.1	27.6	36.5	25.6	3.2
4. Have diverse audiences on advisory boards.	155	2.79	0.83	3.2	36.1	40.6	18.7	1.3
5. Make sure programs include diversity.	156	2.82	0.76	3.2	28.8	51.3	16.0	0.6
6. Provide training around equity, access, and opportunity.	156	2.56	0.82	5.8	46.8	34.6	11.5	1.3
7. Design materials for diverse audiences.	156	2.77	0.81	5.1	30.8	46.8	16.7	0.6

Note. Job Satisfaction Scale: 1 = extremely satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4 dissatisfied; and 5 = extremely dissatisfied.

Table 19 gives the results of the organizational management domain's job satisfaction. There were 59.3% of the respondents who were either extremely satisfied or satisfied with "involvement in professional associations", making it the job responsibility with the greatest job satisfaction (M = 2.32, SD = 0.95). The lowest reported job satisfaction (M = 2.68, SD = 0.86) within the organizational management domain came from "collecting and reporting data and enrollments." There were 15.2% of the respondents who were either dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied with that job responsibility.

Table 18. Descriptive Statistic Results of Job Satisfaction for Job Responsibilities in the Partnership Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Job Satisfaction Descriptives			Frequency Percentage				
Job Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Facilitate youth involvement on 4-H boards and committees.	152	2.44	0.85	9.9	48.0	32.2	7.9	2.0
2. Advocate for youth engagement.	152	2.45	0.80	9.9	44.1	38.2	7.2	0.7
3. Provide opportunities for youth to lead.	152	2.05	0.74	22.4	53.3	21.7	2.6	0.0
4. Involved in community coalitions.	152	2.66	0.87	10.5	28.3	46.7	13.8	0.7
5. Provide work-force skills to youth.	152	2.29	0.84	16.4	46.1	30.3	6.6	0.7
6. Support youth who are working on community change.	152	2.44	0.91	14.5	39.5	35.5	8.6	2.0
7. Work with current boards and committees to increase youth involvement.	151	2.71	0.83	7.3	31.1	40.0	16.6	0.0

Note. Job Satisfaction Scale: 1 = extremely satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4 dissatisfied; and 5 = extremely dissatisfied.

Table 19. Descriptive Statistic Results of Job Satisfaction for Job Responsibilities in the Organizational Management Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Job Satisfaction Descriptives			Frequency Percentage				
Job Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Develop and support both local and state policy and procedures.	145	2.44	0.82	9.0	49.0	31.7	9.7	0.7
2. Work with media and public relations.	145	2.54	0.91	10.3	42.8	29.7	16.6	0.7
3. Collect and report data and enrollments.	145	2.68	0.86	5.5	38.6	40.7	12.4	2.8
4. Work with volunteers and colleagues in risk management.	145	2.48	0.75	4.8	52.4	33.8	8.3	0.7
5. Financial management.	145	2.60	0.74	2.8	46.2	40.0	10.3	0.7
6. Conduct research and share that research.	145	2.52	0.84	9.7	41.4	37.2	11.0	0.7
7. Involved in professional associations.	145	2.32	0.95	20.0	39.3	31.0	7.6	2.1

Note. Job Satisfaction Scale: 1 = extremely satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied; 4 dissatisfied; and 5 = extremely dissatisfied.

ANOVA-Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results for 4-H PRKC Domain Levels of Job Satisfaction

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare the level of job satisfaction for each of the land-grant university (LGU) groups, primary job title (PJT) groups, and the county Extension educators (CEE) by LGU groups for the job responsibilities within each of the six 4-H PRKC domains. The post hoc test, Tukey's HSD, was conducted to determine which groups demonstrated significant differences for the level of job satisfaction. An alpha level of $p < .05$ was used to determine the significance. Items where a significant difference was found are reported in the following sections.

Land-Grant University Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare job satisfaction among the six individual land-grant university (LGU) groups. The six land-grant universities were as follows: (a) the University of Idaho (UI), (b) Oregon State University (OSU), (c) Washington State University (WSU), (d) Montana State University (MSU), (e) Colorado State University (CSU), and (f) the University of Wyoming (UW).

Table 20 is a comparison of the mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test for job responsibility #3 "provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas." There was a significant difference for the 4-H youth development professionals' level of job satisfaction within youth development domain job responsibility #3 "provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas" [$F(5, 187) = 3.06$, $p = 0.011$]. These results indicated that the job satisfaction mean for UI was significantly lower than WSU ($p = 0.009$).

Table 20. Building Relationships for Job Satisfaction of Youth Development Domain Job Responsibility #3[a] Between Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
University of Idaho (UI)	48	1.79	0.74	**UI-WSU**	**0.71**	**0.009**
Washington State University (WSU)	24	2.50	0.78			

Note. $p < .05$; [a]job responsibility #3: provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas.

Table 21 is a comparison of mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test. Within the youth program development domain, there was a significant difference for the youth development professionals' level of job satisfaction for job responsibility #3 "identifies and works with community partners" [$F(6, 167) = 4.81$, $p = 0.000$]. These results denote that the job satisfaction mean for UI was significantly greater than the following LGUs: OSU ($p = 0.010$), WSU ($p = 0.030$), MSU ($p = 0.020$), and CSU ($p < 0.001$).

Table 21. Building Relationships for Job Satisfaction of Youth Program Development Domain Job Responsibility #3[a] Between Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
University of Idaho (UI)	44	2.98	0.82	**UI-OSU**	**0.64**	**0.010**
Oregon State University (OSU)	33	2.33	0.74	**UI-WSU**	**0.68**	**0.030**
Washington State University (WSU)	20	2.30	0.98	**UI-MSU**	**0.59**	**0.020**
Montana State University (MSU)	36	2.39	0.77	**UI-CSU**	**0.87**	**< 0.001**
Colorado State University (CSU)	28	2.11	0.74			

Note. $p < .05$; [a]job responsibility #3: identify and work with community partners.

Table 22 is a comparison of the mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference, based on Tukey's post hoc test, for job responsibilities #5 and #7. There was a significant difference between 4-H youth development professionals' job satisfaction within the volunteerism domain for job responsibility #5 "recognize volunteers" [$F(6, 154) = 3.01$, $p = 0.008$] and for job responsibility #7 "recruitment of

volunteers" [$F(6, 154) = 2.98$, $p = 0.009$]. The test results for job responsibility #5 indicated that the job satisfaction mean for CSU was significantly lower than UI ($p = 0.046$), OSU ($p = 0.034$), and MSU ($p = 0.007$). The test results for job responsibility #7 indicated that the job satisfaction mean for CSU was significantly lower than the following LGUs: UI ($p = 0.045$), OSU ($p = 0.012$), and UW ($p = 0.024$).

Table 22. Building Relationships for Job Satisfaction of Volunteerism Domain Job Responsibilities #5[a] and #7[b] Between Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Job Responsibility #5						
University of Idaho (UI)	41	2.68	0.65	**UI-CSU**	**0.57**	**0.046**
Oregon State University (OSU)	31	2.74	0.77	**OSU-CSU**	**0.63**	**0.034**
Montana State University (MSU)	32	2.84	0.92	**MSU-CSU**	**0.73**	**0.007**
Colorado State University (CSU)	27	2.11	0.70			
Job Responsibility #7						
University of Idaho (UI)	41	2.93	0.79	**UI-CSU**	**0.63**	**0.045**
Oregon State University (OSU)	31	3.06	1.00	**OSU-CSU**	**0.77**	**0.012**
Colorado State University (CSU)	27	2.30	0.87	**CSU-UW**	**0.98**	**0.024**
University of Wyoming (UW)	11	3.24	0.65			

Note. $p < .05$; [a]job responsibility #5: recognize volunteers; and [b]job responsibility #7: recruit volunteers.

Primary Job Title Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the level of job satisfaction between the nine primary job title (PJT) groups of 4-H youth development professionals. The primary job titles were (a) county program assistant (CPA), (b) county program coordinator (CPC), (c) county Extension educator (CEE), (d) area Extension educator (AEE), (e) county chair (CC), (f) state Extension associate (SEA), (g) state specialist (SS), (h) state program leader (SPL), and (i) 4-H youth development professionals with other job titles (OTH).

Table 23 is a comparison of the mean difference for those PJT groups that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test for job responsibility #7. There was a

significant difference in the 4-H youth development professionals' level of jobs satisfaction within the youth development domain for job responsibility #7 "dealing with conflict management issues", $F(8, 188) = 2.98$, $p = 0.004$. These test results indicated that the job satisfaction mean for the CEEs was significantly greater than the SS ($p = 0.047$) and OTH ($p = 0.010$) groups.

Table 23. Building Relationships for Job Satisfaction of Youth Development Domain Job Responsibility #7[a] Between Primary Job Title Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
County Extension Educator (CEE)	106	2.97	0.90	**CEE-SS**	**0.97**	**0.047**
State Specialist (SS)	9	2.00	0.87	**CEE-OTH**	**1.07**	**0.010**
Other (OTH)	10	1.90	0.57			

Note. p < .05; [a]job responsibility #7: -deal with conflict management.

County Extension Educators by Land-Grant University Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare job satisfaction between county Extension educators (CEE) from the six individual land-grant university (LGU) groups. Those six land-grant universities were (a) the University of Idaho (UI), (b) Oregon State University (OSU), (c) Washington State University (WSU), Montana State University (MSU), Colorado State University (CSU), and the University of Wyoming (UW).

Table 24 is a comparison of the mean differences for those CEEs by LGU who had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test. Within the youth development domain, there was a significant difference for the county Extension educators' (CEE) level of job satisfaction for job responsibility #3 "provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas" [$F(5, 99) = 2.10$, $p = 0.072$]. The results indicated that the job-satisfaction mean for the CEEs from UI was significantly lower than the CEEs from WSU ($p = 0.034$).

Table 24. Building Relationships for Job Satisfaction of Youth Development Domain Job Responsibility #3[a] Between County Extension Educators by Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
University of Idaho (UI)	20	1.80	0.77	**UI-WSU**	**1.00**	**0.034**
Washington State University (WSU)	10	2.80	0.79			

Note. $p < .05$; [a]job responsibility #3: provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas.

Table 25 is a comparison for mean differences of job satisfaction for those CEEs by LGU who had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test for the volunteerism domain's job responsibilities #5 "recognize volunteers" and #7 "recruit volunteers." The results indicated that the job-satisfaction mean for the CEEs from CSU was significantly lower than the CEEs from MSU ($p = 0.044$) for job responsibility #5. The job-satisfaction mean for the CEEs from CSU was significantly lower than the CEEs from OSU ($p = 0.041$) for job responsibility #7.

Table 25. Building Relationships for Job Satisfaction of Volunteerism Domain Job Responsibilities #5[a] and #7[b] Between County Extension Educators by Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Job Responsibility #5						
Montana State University (MSU)	25	2.96	0.98	**MSU-CSU**	**0.88**	**0.044**
Colorado State University (CSU)	13	2.08	0.86			
Job Responsibility #7						
Oregon State University (OSU)	17	3.29	1.05	**OSU-CSU**	**0.99**	**0.041**
Colorado State University (CSU)	13	2.31	0.86			

Note. $p < .05$; [a]job responsibility #5: recognize volunteers; and [b]job responsibility #7: recruit volunteers.

Job Satisfaction Survey Results

The 4-H youth development professionals were asked to complete the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) as part of the study as another measure of job satisfaction. The following sections are the results of the survey. The results for the JSS were divided into

nine facets of pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, conditions, co-workers, work itself, and communications.

JSS Scoring Instructions

According to the scoring instructions from Spector (1985), the JSS was created to assess employees' attitude towards their job and certain aspects of that job. Each JSS item was scored from a 1 to 6 when the original responses were used. The Likert-type scale was *1 = disagree very much, 2 = disagree moderately, 3 = disagree slightly, 4 = agree slightly, 5 = agree moderately,* and *6 = agree very much.*

According to Spector (1985), job satisfaction represents an attitudinal reaction to one's job. The JSS used a 6-point, agree-disagree scale, where agreement with positively worded items and disagreement with negatively worded items represented satisfaction, whereas disagreement with positively worded items and agreement with negatively worded items represented dissatisfaction. Based on the scoring instructions from the creator of the JSS (Spector, 1985), in order to determine the level of job satisfaction, the results were to be scored the following way: for the 4-item subscales as well as the 36-item total score, a score with a mean item response (after reverse scoring the negatively worded items) of 4.51 or more represented satisfaction; mean responses of 3.49 or less represented dissatisfaction; and mean scores between 3.50 and 4.50 measured a slight satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

The JSS scoring instructions (Spector, 1985) explained that the statements or items on the JSS were written in each direction: both positive and negative. For those items that were written negatively, the scores needed to be reversed before they were added to the positive items to obtain a total score. A score of 6 represented the strongest agreements.

with a negatively worded item considered the equivalent to a score of 1, representing the strongest disagreement on a positively worded item, allowing the statements to be combined meaningfully. Those item numbers that were reversed were 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 34, and 36.

Job Satisfaction Survey Results

Table 26 provides the overall scores for each of the nine facets within the JSS as well as the overall JSS mean score for the research participants. The nature of work facet had the greatest mean score with $M = 4.93$ ($SD = 0.18$), and the pay facet had the lowest mean of 2.71 ($SD = 0.68$). The overall Job Satisfaction Survey mean score for all respondents was 3.72, with a standard deviation of 0.79.

The supervision and nature of work facet mean scores were above the 4.51 satisfaction measurement level. The fringe benefits, contingent rewards, co-worker, and communication facets had a mean in the range of 3.50-4.50 which, according to the JSS measurement scale, fell within the slight satisfaction or dissatisfaction category. The other three facets, pay, promotion, and operating conditions, had mean scores below 3.49, which categorized them into the dissatisfaction category.

Table 27 shows the results for the pay, promotion, and supervision facets of the JSS. The pay facet had 3 of the 4 statements below $M = 3.49$ (the dissatisfaction level). The statement with the lowest mean ($M = 2.07$, $SD = 1.43$) for this facet was "raises are few and far between." The statement with the greatest mean ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.62$) was "I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me," which indicated the respondents slightly agreed with that statement (or were slightly satisfied).

Table 26. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Job Satisfaction Survey's Nine Facets and the Overall JSS Score for the Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

Facet	*M*	*SD*
Pay	2.71	0.68
Promotion	2.77	0.13
Supervision	4.60	0.24
Fringe Benefits	4.13	0.18
Contingent Rewards	3.58	0.28
Operating Conditions	2.99	0.68
Co-Workers	3.99	1.34
Nature of Work	4.93	0.18
Communication	3.80	0.62
Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Score	3.72	0.79

Note. Satisfaction is measured by the following scale: *M* = 4.51 and above showed satisfaction; *M* = 3.50-4.50 showed slight satisfaction or dissatisfaction; and *M* = 3.49 and below showed dissatisfaction.

The promotion facet had all four statements fall within the dissatisfaction range of the measurement scale. All four statements had mean scores below 3.49. The greatest mean ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.48$) was for the statement "those who do well on the job stand a fair chance for being promoted." The JSS statement with the lowest mean ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.48$) for the fringe benefits facet was "there is really too little chance for promotion in my job."

"My supervisor is unfair to me" was the statement within the supervision facet with the greatest mean ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 1.55$). This JSS statement was 1 of 2 within the supervision facet above a mean score of 4.51, which implies a degree of satisfaction. The other 2 JSS statements were between a mean of 3.50 and 4.50, which was slightly satisfied or dissatisfied.

The fringe benefits, contingent rewards, and operating condition results are described in Table 28. The four statements within the fringe benefits facet all had mean scores between 3.50 and 4.50, which were within the slightly satisfied or dissatisfied category of the JSS measurement scale. The two statements "I am not satisfied with the

benefits I receive" (M = 4.24, SD = 1.48) and "the benefits package we have is equitable" (M = 4.24, SD = 1.33) within the fringe benefits facet both had the same mean.

Table 27. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Job Satisfaction Survey Pay, Promotion, and Supervision Facets for the Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Facet Descriptives			Frequency Percentages					
Facet and JSS Statement	N	M[a]	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay Facet									
1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	143	2.81	1.50	23.1	26.6	19.6	11.9	14.7	4.2
10. Raises are few and far between.[b]	143	2.07	1.43	50.3	21.0	14.0	6.3	2.8	5.6
19. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.[b]	144	3.62	1.62	14.6	12.5	17.4	22.2	18.8	14.6
28. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	144	2.35	1.37	36.1	24.3	20.8	8.3	8.3	2.1
Promotion Facet									
2. There is really too little chance for promotion in my job.[b]	144	2.64	1.48	29.9	21.5	20.8	14.6	9.0	4.2
11. Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	144	2.95	1.48	22.9	18.1	20.8	20.8	13.9	3.5
20. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	141	2.72	1.33	22.0	25.5	24.1	17.0	19.9	1.4
33. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	142	2.76	1.30	19.0	26.8	26.1	17.6	8.5	2.1
Supervision									
3. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	143	4.42	1.55	8.4	4.2	13.3	15.4	28.7	30.1
12. My supervisor is unfair to me.[b]	141	4.89	1.55	5.7	7.1	5.7	8.5	20.6	52.5
21. My supervisor shows little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	143	4.38	1.56	5.6	9.8	11.9	20.3	18.2	34.3
30. I like my supervisor.	142	4.72	1.46	6.3	4.9	5.6	14.1	31.7	37.3

Note. scale: 1 = disagree very much; 2 = disagree moderately; 3 = disagree slightly; 4 = agree slightly; 5 = agree moderately; and 6 = agree very much. [a]satisfaction is measured by the following scale: M = 4.51 and above showed satisfaction; M = 3.50-4.50 showed slight satisfaction and dissatisfaction; and M = 3.49 and below showed dissatisfaction. [b]mean scores for items #10, 19, and 12 have been transformed to take the negatively worded statement into account.

The contingent rewards facet had 3 of the 4 statements below the $M < 3.49$ or dissatisfaction level. The statement with the lowest mean for this facet was "I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be" with the $M = 2.39$ ($SD = 1.44$). The statement with the greatest mean was "I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated" with a mean of 3.99 ($SD = 1.53$). This statement was within the slightly satisfied or dissatisfied level for measuring the JSS.

There were 3 of the 4 JSS statements within the operating condition facet that had mean scores below 3.49, falling into the job dissatisfaction category. Of those, the statement with the lowest level of job satisfaction, based on the mean score ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.21$), was "I have too much to do at work." The greatest mean for this facet was 3.38 ($SD = 1.35$) for the statement "many of the rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult."

Table 29 shows results for the co-worker, nature of work, and communication facets of the JSS. The co-workers facet of the JSS had a single statement with a mean score above 4.51 which illustrated satisfaction. The statement was "I like the people I work with," and the mean was 5.17 ($SD = 1.07$). The JSS statement with the lowest mean ($M = 2.06$, $SD = 1.21$) for the co-workers facet was "I enjoy my co-workers." The other two statements within this facet had a mean score between 3.50 and 4.50, which is at the slightly satisfied or dissatisfied level.

The statement with the greatest mean for this facet was "I feel a sense of pride in doing my job," and the mean was 5.14 ($SD = 0.99$). All four statements within the nature of work itself had mean scores above 4.51. The statement with the lowest mean ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 1.42$) was "I sometimes feel my job is meaningless."

Table 28. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Job Satisfaction Survey Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, and Operating Conditions Facets for the Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Facet Descriptives			Frequency Percentages					
Facet and Statement	*N*	*M*[a]	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fringe Benefits									
4. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.[b]	144	4.24	1.48	3.5	12.5	17.4	14.6	27.8	24.3
13. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	141	4.16	1.46	6.4	9.9	12.8	22.0	30.5	18.4
22. The benefits package we have is equitable.	143	4.24	1.33	3.5	8.4	14.0	27.3	28.7	18.2
29. There are benefits we do not have which we should have.[b]	143	3.86	1.39	7.0	10.5	18.9	28.7	23.1	11.9
Contingent Rewards									
5. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	143	3.43	1.44	11.2	16.1	23.8	23.8	17.5	7.7
14. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.[b]	143	3.99	1.53	7.0	10.5	24.5	11.9	27.3	18.9
23. There are few rewards for those who work here.[b]	144	3.49	1.40	9.7	14.6	27.1	22.2	18.8	7.6
32. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.[b]	140	3.39	1.44	11.4	15.0	30.0	17.9	17.9	7.9
Operating Conditions									
6. Many of the rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.[b]	144	3.38	1.35	10.4	12.5	31.3	29.2	7.6	9.0
15. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	143	3.74	1.32	4.9	13.3	25.2	23.8	25.2	7.7
24. I have too much to do at work.[b]	144	2.33	1.21	31.9	24.3	29.2	8.3	5.7	0.7
31. I have too much paperwork.[b]	143	2.50	1.29	28.7	22.4	28.7	12.6	5.6	2.1

Note. scale: 1 = disagree very much; 2 = disagree moderately; 3 = disagree slightly; 4 = agree slightly; 5 agree moderately; and 6 = agree very much. [a]satisfaction is measured by the following scale: *M* = 4.51 and above showed satisfaction; *M* = 3.50-4.50 showed slight satisfaction or dissatisfaction; and *M* = 3.49 and below showed dissatisfaction. [b]mean scores for items #29, 4, 14, 23, 32, 24, and 31 have been transformed to take the negatively worded statement into account.

The last facet of the JSS was communication. Three of the four statements within this facet were within the slightly satisfied or dissatisfied scale (a mean between 3.50 and 4.50). "The goals of this organization are not clear to me" was the statement with the

greatest mean (M = 4.38, SD = 1.45). The JSS statement "communication seems good within this organization" had the lowest mean (M = 3.18, SD = 1.33).

Table 29. Descriptive Statistic Results for the Job Satisfaction Survey Co-Worker, Nature of Work, and Communication Facets for the Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Facet Descriptives			Frequency Percentages					
Facet and Statement	*N*	*M*[a]	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6
Co-Worker									
1. I like the people I work with.	142	5.17	1.07	0.7	2.8	4.9	12.0	29.6	50.0
16. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.[b]	144	4.33	1.39	3.5	6.9	18.1	21.5	25.0	25.0
25. I enjoy my co-workers.	142	2.06	1.21	43.7	23.9	20.4	19.2	0.0	2.8
34. There is too much bickering and fighting at work.[b]	141	4.38	1.56	5.0	9.2	17.7	13.5	20.6	34.0
Nature of Work									
2. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.[b]	144	4.70	1.42	2.8	7.6	11.8	10.4	29.2	38.2
17. I like doing the things I do at work.	144	4.97	1.00	1.4	0.7	4.9	18.8	41.0	33.3
27. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	144	5.14	0.99	0.7	2.1	2.8	14.6	36.8	43.1
35. My job is enjoyable.	144	4.92	1.08	1.4	3.5	3.5	17.4	42.4	31.9
Communication									
3. Communications seem good within this organization.	144	3.18	1.33	13.2	18.8	25.0	25.0	16.0	2.1
18. The goals of this organization are not clear to me.[b]	143	4.38	1.45	4.2	10.5	10.5	18.2	30.8	25.9
26. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.[b]	144	3.36	1.34	6.9	25.7	16.7	31.3	13.9	5.6
36. Work assignments are not fully explained.[b]	142	4.27	1.38	3.5	9.2	15.5	21.1	30.3	20.4

Note. scale: 1 = disagree very much; 2 = disagree moderately; 3 = disagree slightly; 4 = agree slightly; 5 = agree moderately; and 6 = agree very much. [a]satisfaction is measured by the following scale: M = 4.51 and above showed satisfaction; M = 3.50 - 4.50 showed ambivalence; and M = 3.49 and below showed dissatisfaction. [b]mean scores for items #6, 16, 34, 8, 18, 26, and 36 have been transformed to take the negatively worded statement into account.

ANOVA-Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results for the Job Satisfaction Survey

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare each of the land-grant university (LGU) groups, primary job title (PJT) groups, and county Extension educators (CEE) by LGU groups for each of the statements within the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). For those groups that had a significant difference, Tukey's post hoc test was conducted to determine which groups demonstrated the differences. An alpha level of $p < .05$ was used to determine the significance.

For the Job Satisfaction Survey results, there were some ANOVA results that had p values over the significance level of .05. When the Tukey tests were conducted at the same time as the ANOVA tests, the results were different between some of the groups below the $p < .05$ level. For these items, the Tukey procedure results are reported.

Land-Grant University Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the JSS statements within the nine facets for the six individual land-grant university (LGU) groups. Those six land-grant universities were the University of Idaho, Oregon State University, Washington State University, Montana State University, Colorado State University, and the University of Wyoming.

Pay, promotion, and supervision facets. Table 30 is a comparison of the mean difference for the LGUs that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc procedure for the pay, promotion, and supervision facets of the JSS. The results indicated that the mean for the item "raises are few and far between" for CSU was significantly lower than UW ($p = 0.041$).

There was a significant correlation between the 4-H youth development professionals' responses to the supervision facet for the statement "I like my supervisor" [$F(5, 136) = 2.55$, $p = 0.031$]. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for statement #30 for 4-H youth development professionals from UI was significantly higher than UW ($p = 0.016$).

All four JSS statements within the fringe benefits showed some significance within the LGU groups. There was a significant difference for the responses for statement #4 "I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive": $F(5, 138) = 3.45$, $p = 0.006$. The Tukey post hoc test indicated that mean scores for statement #4 for the 4-H youth development professionals from UI were significantly lower than OSU ($p = 0.001$). Statement #13 "The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer" had a significant difference of $F(5, 135) = 3.29$, $p = 0.008$. The post hoc results, using the Tukey test, had a mean for statement #13 from the UI 4-H youth development professionals that was significantly lower than OSU ($p = 0.022$) and UW ($p = 0.029$). Also within the fringe benefits facet, there was a significant difference for statement #22 "the benefit package we have is equitable": $F(5, 137) = 7.08$, $p < 0.001$. The post hoc Tukey tests revealed the mean for this statement from the UI 4-H youth development professionals was significantly lower than OSU ($p < 0.001$) and UW ($p < 0.001$). The Tukey test results also indicated that the mean for statement #22 from CSU was significantly lower than the mean from OSU ($p = 0.011$) and UW ($p = 0.012$). Finally, the fourth statement in the fringe benefits was statement #29 "there are benefits we do not have which we should have," which had a significant difference of $F(5, 137) = 4.62$, $p = 0.001$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated that the

mean scores for statement #29 from the UI 4-H youth development professionals was significantly lower than OSU ($p < 0.001$) and WSU ($p = 0.024$).

Table 30. Building Relationships for the Job Satisfaction Survey for Pay, Supervision, and Fringe Benefits Facets Between Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

JSS Facet and Statement	*N*	*M*[a]	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Pay Facet, Item #10[b]						
Colorado State University (CSU)	25	1.64	1.19	**CSU-UW**	**1.56**	**0.041**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	3.20	1.81			
Supervision Facet, Item #30[c]						
University of Idaho (UI)	39	5.15	0.99	**UI-UW**	**1.65**	**0.016**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	3.50	1.72			
Fringe Benefits Facet, Item #4[d]						
University of Idaho (UI)	40	3.68	1.46	**UI-OSU**	**1.49**	**0.001**
Oregon State University (OSU)	25	5.16	1.11			
Fringe Benefits Facet, Item #13[e]						
University of Idaho (UI)	39	3.56	1.25	**UI-OSU**	**1.18**	**0.022**
Oregon State University (OSU)	23	4.74	1.48	**UI-UW**	**1.54**	**0.029**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	5.10	1.45			
Fringe Benefits Facet, Item #22[f]						
University of Idaho (UI)	39	3.56	1.25	**UI-OSU**	**1.48**	**< 0.001**
Oregon State University (OSU)	25	5.04	1.10	**UI-UW**	**1.84**	**< 0.001**
Colorado State University (CSU)	25	3.88	1.17	**OSU-CSU**	**1.16**	**0.011**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	5.40	0.70	**CSU-UW**	**1.52**	**0.012**
Fringe Benefits Facet, Item #29[g]						
University of Idaho (UI)	39	3.15	1.25	**UI-OSU**	**1.45**	**< 0.001**
Oregon State University (OSU)	25	4.60	1.44	**UI-WSU**	**1.20**	**0.024**
Washington State University (WSU)	17	4.35	1.22			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]Job Satisfaction Survey scale: 1 = disagree very much; 2 = disagree moderately; 3 = disagree slightly; 4 = agree slightly; 5 = agree moderately; and 6 = agree very much. [b]statement #10: raises are few and far between. [c]statement #30: I like my supervisor. [d]statement #4: I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. [e]statement #13: the benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer. [f]statement #22: the benefits package we have is equitable. [g]statement #29: there are benefits we do not have which we should have.

Operating conditions, co-worker, nature of work, and communication facets.

Table 31 is a comparison of the mean difference for the LGUs that had a significant difference based on the Tukey's post hoc procedure for the operating conditions, co-worker, nature of work, and communication facets of the JSS. The operating conditions facet results had a significant difference for statement #24 "I have too much to do at work."

$F(5, 138) = 2.87, p = 0.017$. The Tukey post hoc test results indicated that the mean for statement #24 for OSU was significantly lower than UW ($p = 0.021$).

The co-worker facet ANOVA results had significant correlations between the responses from the 4-H youth development professionals for three of the statements. The first difference was with statement #7 "I like the people that I work with," and the results were $F(5, 136) = 4.59, p = 0.001$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated the mean for this statement from UW was significantly lower than from UI ($p = 0.001$), OSU ($p = 0.017$), WSU ($p = 0.007$), MSU ($p = 0.007$), and CSU ($p < 0.001$). The responses for statement #25 (I enjoy my co-workers) in the co-worker facet had a significant difference of $F(5, 137) = 4.62, p = 0.001$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated the mean for this statement from UW was significantly lower than UI ($p = 0.011$), MSU ($p = 0.045$), and CSU ($p = 0.003$). The last difference in the co-worker facet was with the responses from statement #34 "there is too much bickering and fighting at work," where there was a significance of $F(5, 135) = 2.29, p = 0.049$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated the mean for this statement from UW was significantly lower than MSU ($p = 0.035$) and CSU ($p = 0.026$). The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated the mean for the nature of work facet, statement #35 "my job is enjoyable," from CSU was significantly lower than from UW ($p = 0.040$).

A significant difference was discovered for the results of communications facet statement #9 "communication seems good within this organization," $F(5, 138) = 3.22, p = 0.009$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated the mean for this statement from MSU was significantly greater than UW ($p = 0.011$). There was another significant difference within the results of the communications facet for statement #26 "I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization," $F(5, 138) = 3.59, p = 0.004$. The Tukey's post

hoc test results indicated that the mean for this statement from OSU was significantly lower than from MSU ($p = 0.001$). Finally, within the results of the communications facet, statement #36 "work assignments are not fully explained" had a significant difference of $F(5, 136) = 2.43$, $p = 0.038$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated that the mean for this statement from CSU had a significantly higher mean than UW ($p = 0.022$).

Primary Job Title Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the JSS statements for the nine facets for the nine primary job title groups of 4-H youth development professionals. The primary job titles were (a) county program assistant (CPA), (b) county program coordinator (CPC), (c) county Extension educator (CEE), (d) area Extension educator (AEE), (e) county chair (CC), (f) state Extension associate (SEA), (g) state specialist (SS), (h) state program leader (SPL), and (i) 4-H youth development professionals with other job titles (OTH).

Table 32 reveals a comparison of the mean differences for the primary job title (PJT) groups that had a significant difference based on the Tukey's post hoc procedure. There was a significant difference between the 4-H youth development professionals' responses for the operating condition facet's statement #6 "many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult": $F(8, 135) = 2.02$, $p = 0.049$. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for this statement for the CEEs was significantly lower than the OTH group ($p = 0.035$). The other JSS statement where the responses had a significant difference was statement #18 "the goals of this organization are not clear to me" in the communications facet [$F(8, 134) = 2.21$, $p = 0.031$]. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for the CPA group was significantly greater than the AEE group ($p = 0.010$).

Table 31. Building Relationships for the Job Satisfaction Survey for Operating Conditions, Co-Worker, Nature of Work, and Communication Facets Between Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

JSS Facet and Statement	*N*	*M*[a]	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Operating Conditions Facet, Statement #24[b]						
Oregon State University (OSU)	25	1.80	1.04	**OSU-UW**	**1.40**	**0.021**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	3.20	1.55			
Co-Worker Facet, Statement #7[c]						
University of Idaho (UI)	39	5.28	1.00	**UI-UW**	**1.48**	**0.001**
Oregon State University (OSU)	25	5.04	1.24	**OSU-UW**	**1.24**	**0.017**
Washington State University (WSU)	16	5.25	0.93	**WSU-UW**	**1.45**	**0.007**
Montana State University (MSU)	27	5.22	0.85	**MSU-UW**	**1.42**	**0.003**
Colorado State University (CSU)	25	5.56	0.77	**CSU-UW**	**1.76**	**0.000**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	3.80	1.48			
Co-Worker Facet, Statement #25[d]						
University of Idaho (UI)	40	5.10	0.98	**UI-UW**	**1.40**	**0.011**
Montana State University (MSU)	27	4.96	1.02	**MSU-UW**	**1.26**	**0.045**
Colorado State University (CSU)	23	5.39	0.84	**CSU-UW**	**1.69**	**0.003**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	3.70	2.11			
Co-Worker Facet, Statement #34[e]						
Montana State University (MSU)	27	4.70	1.30	**MSU-UW**	**1.70**	**0.035**
Colorado State University (CSU)	24	4.79	1.47	**CSU-UW**	**1.79**	**0.026**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	3.00	1.83			
Nature of Work Facet, Statement #35[f]						
Colorado State University (CSU)	25	5.28	0.74	**CSU-UW**	**1.18**	**0.040**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	4.10	1.60			
Communication Facet, Statement #9[g]						
Montana State University (MSU)	27	3.81	1.27	**MSU-UW**	**1.62**	**0.011**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	2.20	1.14			
Communication Facet, Statement #26[h]						
Oregon State University (OSU)	25	2.84	1.46	**OSU-MSU**	**1.42**	**0.001**
Montana State University (MSU)	27	4.26	1.23			
Communication Facet, Statement #36[i]						
Colorado State University (CSU)	25	4.80	1.23	**CSU-UW**	**1.60**	**0.022**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	3.20	1.40			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]Job Satisfaction Survey scale: 1 = disagree very much; 2 = disagree moderately; 3 = disagree slightly; 4 = agree slightly; 5 = agree moderately; and 6 = agree very much. [b]statement #24: I have too much to do at work. [c]statement #7: I like the people I work with. [d]statement #25: I enjoy my co-workers. [e]statement #34: there is too much bickering and fighting at work. [f]statement #35: my job is enjoyable. [g]statement #9: communication seems good within this organization. [h]statement #26: I often feel that I do not know what is going on within the organization. [i]statement #36: work assignments are not fully explained.

County Extension Educators by Land-Grant University Groups

Pay, promotion, and fringe benefits facet. Table 33 is a comparison of the mean difference for the results of the CEEs by LGU that showed a significant difference, based on

Tukey's post hoc test for the Job Satisfaction Survey pay, promotion, and fringe benefits facets. Within the pay facet results, there was a significant difference for statement #10 "raises are few and far between" for the CEE groups by LGU [$F(5, 69) = 2.75$, $p = 0.025$]. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for this statement for the UI CEEs was significantly lower than the UW CEEs ($p = 0.031$). The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for promotion facet statement #33 "I am satisfied with my chances for promotion" from the UI CEEs was significantly greater than the CSU CEEs ($p = 0.044$).

Table 32. Building Relationships for the Job Satisfaction Survey for Operating Conditions and Communication Facets Between Primary Job Title Groups with $p < .05$

JSS Facet and Statement	*N*	*M*[a]	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Operating Conditions Facet, Statement #6[b]						
County Extension Educators (CEE)	75	3.16	1.26	**CEE-OTH**	**1.70**	**0.035**
Other Job Titles (OTH)	7	4.86	1.41			
Communication Facet, Statement #18[c]						
County Program Assistants (CPA)	11	5.27	1.10	**CPA-AEE**	**3.02**	**0.010**
Area Extension Educators (AEE)	4	2.25	1.96			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]Job Satisfaction Survey scale: 1 = disagree very much; 2 = disagree moderately; 3 = disagree slightly; 4 = agree slightly; 5 = agree moderately; and 6 = agree very much. [b]statement #6: many of the rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult. [c]statement #18: the goals of this organization are not clear to me.

There were significant differences for the results of two statements within the fringe benefits facet. Statement #4 "I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive" was significantly different [$F(5, 69) = 2.61$, $p = 0.032$]. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for this statement for the UI CEEs was significantly lower than the OSU CEEs ($p = 0.011$). Statement #22 "the benefit package we have is equitable" was also significantly different [$F(5, 68) = 4.59$, $p = 0.001$]. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated the mean for this statement for the UI CEEs was significantly lower than the OSU

($p = 0.011$) and UW ($p = 0.048$) CEEs. The Tukey post hoc test results also revealed that the mean from the OSU CEEs was significantly greater than the WSU CEEs ($p = 0.024$) for statement #22.

Table 33. Building Relationships for the Job Satisfaction Survey for Pay, Promotion, and Fringe Benefits Facets Between County Extension Educators Aggregated by Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

JSS Facet and Statement	*N*	*M*[a]	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Pay Facet, Statement #10[b]						
University of Idaho (UI)	15	1.33	0.62	**UI-UW**	**2.17**	**0.031**
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	3.50	2.07			
Promotion Facet, Statement #33[c]						
University of Idaho (UI)	15	3.73	0.96	**UI-CSU**	**1.64**	**0.044**
Colorado State University (CSU)	11	2.09	1.14			
Fringe Benefits Facet, Statement #4[d]						
University of Idaho (UI)	15	3.40	0.91	**UI-OSU**	**1.73**	**0.011**
Oregon State University (OSU)	15	5.13	1.19			
Fringe Benefits Facet, Statement #22[e]						
University of Idaho (UI)	14	3.50	0.94	**UI-OSU**	**1.50**	**0.011**
Oregon State University (OSU)	15	5.00	1.20	**UI-UW**	**1.67**	**0.048**
Washington State University (WSU)	8	3.38	1.60	**OSU-WSU**	**1.63**	**0.024**
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	5.17	0.75			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]Job Satisfaction Survey scale: 1 = disagree very much; 2 = disagree moderately; 3 = disagree slightly; 4 = agree slightly; 5 = agree moderately; and 6 = agree very much. [b]statement #10: raises are few and far between. [c]statement #33: I am satisfied with my chances for promotion. [d]statement #4: I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. [e]statement #22: the benefits package we have is equitable.

Operating conditions, co-worker, and communication facets. Table 34 is a comparison of the mean differences for the CEEs by LGU that had a significant difference, based on Tukey's post hoc tests for the Job Satisfaction Survey operating conditions, co-worker, and communication facets. There was a significant difference for the responses within the operating conditions facet for statement #24 "I have too much work to do" [$F(5, 69) = 2.83$, $p = 0.022$]. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated the mean for this statement for the UW CEEs was significantly higher than the CEEs from both OSU ($p =$

0.032) and WSU ($p = 0.047$). There was also a significant difference for the responses within the operating conditions facet for statement #31 "I have too much paperwork" [$F(5, 69) = 2.57, p = 0.034$]. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for this statement for the OSU CEEs was significantly lower than the UW CEEs ($p = 0.030$).

There were three JSS statements within the co-worker facet in which the responses had differences. Statement #7 "I like the people I work with" had a significant difference for the CEEs by LGU: $F(5, 69) = 2.59, p = 0.033$. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for this statement for the UW CEEs was significantly lower than the CEEs from both UI ($p = 0.044$) and CSU ($p = 0.014$). The second statement from the co-worker facet with a significant difference was statement #25 "I enjoy my co-workers" [$F(5, 68) = 2.44, p = 0.043$]. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for this statement for the CSU CEEs was significantly lower than the UW CEEs ($p = 0.023$). The last co-worker facet statement, #34 "there is too much bickering and fighting at work," had a significant difference of $F(5, 68) = 3.20, p = 0.012$. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for this statement for the CSU CEEs was significantly greater than the UW CEEs ($p = 0.012$).

The final statement for the CEE responses by LGU with a significant difference was statement #26 "I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization" in the communications facet of the JSS [$F(5, 69) = 2.82, p = 0.022$]. The Tukey post hoc procedure results indicated that the mean for this statement for the OSU CEEs was significantly lower than the MSU CEEs ($p = 0.031$).

Table 34. Building Relationships for the Job Satisfaction Survey for Operating Conditions, Co-Worker, and Communication Facets Between County Extension Educators Aggregated by Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

JSS Facet and Statement	*N*	*M*[a]	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Operating Conditions Facet, Statement #24[b]						
Oregon State University (OSU)	15	1.60	0.83	**OSU-UW**	**1.57**	**0.032**
Washington State University (WSU)	8	1.50	0.54	**WSU-UW**	**1.67**	**0.047**
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	3.17	1.60			
Operating Conditions Facet, Statement #31[c]						
Oregon State University (OSU)	15	1.93	1.10	**OSU-UW**	**1.73**	**0.030**
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	3.67	1.21			
Co-Worker Facet, Statement #7[d]						
University of Idaho (UI)	15	5.27	0.59	**UI-UW**	**1.43**	**0.044**
Colorado State University (CSU)	11	5.55	0.69	**CSU-UW**	**1.71**	**0.014**
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	3.83	1.94			
Co-Worker Facet, Statement #25[e]						
Colorado State University (CSU)	10	5.70	1.22	**CSU-UW**	**1.87**	**0.023**
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	3.83	1.60			
Co-Worker Facet, Statement #34[f]						
Colorado State University (CSU)	11	5.36	1.03	**CSU-UW**	**2.53**	**0.012**
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	2.83	1.84			
Communication Facet, Statement #26[g]						
Oregon State University (OSU)	15	2.67	1.29	**OSU-MSU**	**1.38**	**0.031**
Montana State University (MSU)	20	4.05	1.32			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]Job Satisfaction Survey scale: 1 = disagree very much; 2 = disagree moderately; 3 = disagree slightly; 4 = agree slightly; 5 = agree moderately; and 6 = agree very much. [b]statement #24: I have too much to do at work. [c]statement #31: I have too much paperwork. [d]statement #7: I like the people I work with. [e]statement #25: I enjoy my co-workers. [f]statement #34: There is too much bickering and fighting at work. [g]statement #26: I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.

Self-Reported Job Satisfaction Results

The research participants were asked to report their level of job satisfaction using a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5 with *1 = extremely satisfied* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied.* The 4-H youth development professionals who participated in the study (n = 144) conveyed a self-reported job satisfaction mean of 2.20 (SD = 0.83). The frequency distribution of the responses denoted that 12.5% of the participants were extremely satisfied with the job, that 66.7% of the respondents were satisfied with the job, and that 11.1% were neither satisfied

nor dissatisfied with the job. Finally, 9.7% of the respondents were dissatisfied or extremely dissatisfied with their job.

ANOVA-Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results for Self-Reported Job Satisfaction

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the overall job satisfaction for each of the land-grant university (LGU) groups, primary job title (PJT) groups, and county Extension educators by LGU groups for the self-reported level of job satisfaction. The post hoc test, Tukey's HSD, was conducted to determine which groups had significant differences. An alpha level of $p < .05$ was used to determine the significance.

Land-Grant University Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the overall level of job satisfaction for the six individual land-grant university (LGU) groups. The scale for this question was *1 = extremely satisfied, 2 = satisfied, 3 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 4 = dissatisfied,* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied.*

Table 35 is a comparison of the mean variation difference for the LGUs that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test for the self-reported level of overall job satisfaction. There was a significant difference found for the self-reported degree of job satisfaction [$F(5, 138) = 2.47, p = 0.035$]. The Tukey post hoc test indicated that the mean for overall job satisfaction at CSU was significantly lower than UW ($p = 0.041$).

Table 35. Building Relationships for Self-Reported Level of Overall Job Satisfaction for Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Colorado State University (CSU)	25	1.80	0.58	**CSU-UW**	**0.90**	**0.041**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	2.70	1.06			

Note. $p < .05$.

4-H PRKC Domain Burnout Results

After ranking the individual job responsibilities within the six domains, research participants were asked to self-report their degree of burnout for each of the six 4-H PRKC domains. Table 36 is the self-reported degree of burnout results for individual domains. The 4-H youth development professionals reported having a slight to small degree of burnout related to all six domains. The greatest degree of burnout was with the volunteerism domain ($M = 3.23, SD = 1.19$). The lowest degree of burnout was within the youth development domain ($M = 2.23, SD = 1.08$).

Table 36. Descriptive Statistic Results of the Self-Reported Burnout of the 4-H PRKC Domains for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Burnout Descriptives			Frequency Percentages				
Domain	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
Youth Development Domain	189	2.23	1.08	31.7	29.1	25.9	11.1	2.1
Youth Program Development Domain	191	2.68	1.31	25.1	19.4	30.4	13.1	12.0
Volunteerism Domain	193	3.23	1.19	10.4	15.0	30.6	29.0	15.0
Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain	177	2.41	1.09	25.4	27.7	30.5	13.6	2.8
Partnership Domain	178	2.40	1.03	22.5	31.5	32.0	11.8	2.2
Organizational Management Domain	185	2.88	1.26	18.4	20.0	27.6	23.8	10.3

Note. burnout Scale: 1=a very small degree; 2=a small degree; 3=somewhat; 4=a large degree; and 5= a very large degree.

After ranking the individual job responsibilities within each of the six domains, the research participants were asked to self-report their burnout level for each of the seven job responsibilities. The scale for this portion of the survey was *1 = to a very small degree, 2 = to a small degree, 3 = somewhat, 4 = to a large degree,* and *5 = to a very large degree.*

Table 37 shows the descriptive statistic results for the degree of burnout related to the 4-H PRKC youth development domain. Job responsibility #1 "participating in professional development opportunities related to growth and development" had the lowest

level of reported burnout based on a mean of 1.77 (SD = 1.03), and 77.7% of the respondents reported a small degree or a very small degree of burnout. With 44.9% of the respondents reporting either a large degree or a very large degree of burnout, job responsibility #7 "dealing with conflict management issues" had the greatest level of burnout (M = 3.21, SD = 1.26) within the youth development domain.

Table 37. Descriptive Statistic Results for Job-Responsibility Burnout in the Youth Development Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

Job Responsibility	Burnout Descriptive			Frequency Percentages				
	N	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Professional development related to growth and development.	198	1.78	1.03	54.0	23.7	15.2	4.5	2.5
2. Create programs for youth.	195	2.05	1.01	38.5	27.2	25.6	8.2	0.5
3. Provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas.	194	2.36	1.14	29.9	23.7	30.4	12.4	3.6
4. Create positive relationships.	196	2.31	1.12	30.1	26.5	29.1	10.7	3.6
5. Promote positive behaviors.	193	2.49	1.05	20.7	27.5	37.3	10.9	3.6
6. Develop programs to practice life skills.	195	2.10	1.07	35.9	31.3	22.6	7.2	3.1
7. Deal with conflict management.	196	3.21	1.26	12.8	14.8	27.6	28.1	16.8

Note. burnout scale: 1=a very small degree; 2=a small degree; 3=somewhat; 4=a large degree; and 5=a very large degree.

Table 38 gives the burnout results for the youth program development domain job responsibilities. The respondents had a low degree of burnout (M = 1.90, SD = 0.94) with job responsibility #5 "selecting, developing, adapting, and/or utilizing quality youth development curricula." There were 74.8% respondents who reported either a small degree or a very small degree of burnout. The job responsibility where the 4-H youth development professionals had the greatest level of burnout (M = 2.56, SD = 1.17) was #6 "evaluating programs and communicating those results." There were 24.0% of the respondents who reported a large degree or a very large degree of burnout for this job responsibility.

Table 38. Descriptive Statistic Results for Job-Responsibility Burnout in the Youth Program Development Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

Job Responsibility	Burnout Descriptives			Frequency Percentages				
	N	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Use research & citizen perspectives for program ideas.	172	2.02	1.00	39.0	28.5	26.2	4.7	1.7
2. Work with advisory boards.	171	2.29	1.13	32.2	23.4	32.7	7.0	4.7
3. Identify & work with community partners.	171	2.02	0.94	36.3	31.6	27.5	3.5	1.2
4. Spend time planning programs and communicating those plans.	172	2.20	1.08	34.3	25.6	27.9	10.5	1.7
5. Select, develop, adapt, and/or utilize quality youth development curricula.	171	1.91	0.94	40.9	33.9	20.5	2.9	1.8
6. Evaluate programs and communicate those results.	171	2.56	1.17	24.6	22.2	29.2	20.5	3.5
7. Work with committees or design teams to develop programs.	170	2.34	1.13	27.1	32.4	24.1	12.4	4.1

Note. burnout scale: 1=a very small degree; 2=a small degree; 3=somewhat; 4=a large degree; and 5= a very large degree.

Within Table 39, the results for the volunteerism domain are shared. There were two job responsibilities with the same mean. Job responsibility #5 "recognize volunteers" had a greater frequency of responses for burnout to a very small degree (score of a 1). Job responsibility #5 (M = 1.96, SD = 1.04) had 71.7% of the responses that reported a small to very small degree of burnout. Job responsibility #6 "use written volunteer position descriptions" also had a mean of 1.96 (SD = 1.08), but 68.6% of the respondents reported burnout to a small degree or a very small degree. Using volunteer committees (job responsibility #1) had the greatest degree of burnout (M = 2.51, SD = 1.22) with 22.6% of the respondents reporting a large or very large degree of burnout.

Table 40 shares the descriptive statistic results for the equity, access, and opportunity domain. Job responsibility #1 "building relationships with the community" had the lowest degree of burnout (M = 2.04, SD = 1.12). There were 66.0% of the respondents who reported a small degree or a very small degree of burnout. There were 23.9% of the respondents who reported a large degree or a very large degree of burnout when recruiting,

supporting, and retaining diverse volunteers (job responsibility #3). This job responsibility had the greatest degree of burnout ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.17$) for the equity, access, and opportunity domain.

Table 39. Descriptive Statistic Results for Job-Responsibility Burnout in the Volunteerism Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Burnout Descriptives			Frequency Percentage				
Job Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Use volunteer committees.	160	2.51	1.22	26.9	24.4	26.3	16.3	6.3
2. Complete a formal volunteer selection process.	159	1.99	1.09	44.7	23.9	22.0	6.9	2.5
3. Provide educational opportunities for volunteers.	159	2.16	1.04	32.7	30.8	25.8	8.8	1.9
4. Provide performance feedback to volunteers.	158	2.18	1.08	37.3	19.6	32.3	9.5	1.3
5. Recognize volunteers.	159	1.96	1.04	43.4	28.3	18.2	8.8	1.3
6. Use written volunteer position descriptions.	159	1.96	1.08	47.2	21.4	22.0	7.5	1.9
7. Recruit volunteers.	159	2.50	1.24	28.3	22.6	25.8	17.0	6.3

Note. burnout scale: 1=a very small degree; 2=a small degree; 3=somewhat; 4=a large degree; and 5=a very large degree.

Table 40. Descriptive Statistic Results for Job-Responsibility Burnout in the Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Burnout Descriptives			Frequency Percentages				
Job Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Build relationships within the community.	156	2.04	1.12	43.6	22.4	22.4	9.0	2.6
2. Marketing program to diverse audiences.	155	2.13	1.07	36.8	25.2	29.0	6.5	2.6
3. Recruit, support, and retain diverse volunteers.	155	2.60	1.17	24.5	18.7	32.9	20.0	3.9
4. Have diverse audiences on advisory boards.	153	2.33	1.12	29.4	26.1	30.7	9.8	3.9
5. Make sure programs include diversity.	154	2.31	1.12	29.9	27.3	28.6	10.4	3.9
6. Provide training around equity, access, and opportunity.	154	2.28	1.15	31.2	28.6	26.6	8.4	5.2
7. Design materials for diverse audiences.	155	2.17	1.17	38.7	22.6	27.1	6.5	5.2

Note: burnout scale: 1=a very small degree; 2=a small degree; 3=somewhat; 4=a large degree; and 5= a very large degree.

The burnout descriptive statistic results for the partnership domain are reported in Table 41. The lowest burnout ($M = 1.81$, $SD = 0.96$) was job responsibility #1 "facilitate

youth involvement on 4-H boards and committees." There were 74.2% of the respondents who reported a small degree or a very small degree of burnout. Job responsibility #7 "working with current boards and committees to increase youth involvement" had the greatest level of burnout (M = 2.09, SD = 1.05). There were 9.4% of the respondents who reported a large degree or a very large degree of burnout.

Table 41. Descriptive Statistic Results for Job-Responsibility Burnout in the Partnership Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Burnout Descriptives			Frequency Percentage				
Job Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Facilitate youth involvement on 4-H boards and committees.	151	1.81	0.96	51.0	23.2	20.5	4.6	0.7
2. Advocate for youth engagement.	151	1.94	0.98	42.4	27.8	24.5	4.0	1.3
3. Provide opportunities for youth to lead.	152	1.93	0.96	42.1	30.3	21.1	5.9	0.7
4. Involved in community coalitions.	151	2.00	1.08	45.0	20.5	25.8	6.6	2.0
5. Provide work-force skills to youth.	151	2.03	0.96	37.1	29.8	27.2	5.3	0.7
6. Support youth who are working on community change.	151	1.95	1.03	44.4	25.8	21.9	6.6	1.3
7. Work with current boards and committees to increase youth involvement.	149	2.09	1.05	36.9	28.2	25.5	7.4	2.0

Note. burnout scale: 1=a very small degree; 2=a small degree; 3=somewhat; 4=a large degree; and 5 a very large degree.

Table 42 shows the descriptive statistics for the organizational management domain's burnout for the 7 job responsibilities. There were 80.2% of respondents who reported a small degree or a very small degree of burnout with job responsibility #7 "involvement in professional associations," making this the job responsibility with the lowest level of reported burnout (M = 1.65, SD = 0.92). The greatest burnout (M = 2.54, SD = 1.28) within the organizational management domain came from job responsibility #1 "developing and supporting both local and state 4-H policies and procedures." This job responsibility had 21.5% of the respondents reporting a large degree or a very large degree of burnout.

Table 42. Descriptive Statistic Results for Job-Responsibility Burnout in the Organizational Management Domain for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Burnout Descriptives			Frequency Percentage				
Job Responsibility	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5
1. Develop and support both local and state policy and procedures.	144	2.54	1.28	27.8	21.5	29.2	11.8	9.7
2. Work with media and public relations.	145	2.11	1.12	39.3	25.5	22.8	9.7	2.8
3. Collect and report data and enrollments.	145	2.49	1.24	30.3	17.9	30.3	15.2	6.2
4. Work with volunteers and colleagues in risk management.	144	2.19	1.08	35.4	23.6	27.8	12.5	0.7
5. Financial management.	144	2.36	1.03	25.0	27.8	35.4	9.7	2.1
6. Conduct research and share that research.	144	1.96	1.13	47.2	25.0	16.0	8.3	3.5
7. Involved in professional associations.	141	1.65	0.92	59.6	20.6	15.6	3.5	0.7

Note. burnout scale: 1=a very small degree; 2=a small degree; 3 somewhat; 4 a large degree; and 5 a very large degree.

ANOVA-Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results for the 4-H PRKC Domain's Burnout Level

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the degree of burnout for all the land-grant university (LGU) groups, primary job title (PJT) groups, and county Extension educators by LGU groups for the job responsibilities within each of the 4-H PRKC domains. The post hoc test, Tukey's HSD, was conducted to determine which groups had significant differences. An alpha level of $p < .05$ was used to determine the significance.

For the 4-H PRKC domain job responsibilities, there were some ANOVA results that had p values over the significance level of .05. When the Tukey tests were conducted at the same time as the ANOVA tests, the results indicated differences between some groups below the $p < .05$ level. For these items, the Tukey procedure results are reported.

Land-Grant University Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the burnout of the six individual land-grant university (LGU) groups for the 4-H PRKC domains. Job responsibility #3 "provide opportunities to explore in project areas" within the youth development domain

had a significant difference for burnout, $F(5, 188) = 2.78$, $p = 0.019$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated that there were no means for this job responsibility that had a significant difference below the $p < .05$ level.

There was a significant difference within the youth development domain's reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #4 "create positive relations with members, parents, volunteers, and the community" [$F(5, 190) = 1.73$, $p = 0.130$]. Table 43 is a comparison of mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test results for job responsibility #4. Those results indicated that the UI mean score was significantly greater than WSU ($p = 0.009$).

Table 43. Building Relationships for Burnout of Youth Development Domain Job Responsibility #4[a] Between Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
University of Idaho (UI)	49	2.59	1.19	**UI-WSU**	**0.80**	**0.048**
Washington State University (WSU)	24	1.79	1.18			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]job responsibility #4: –create positive relationships.

Job responsibility #1 "use of volunteer committees" within the volunteerism domain had a significant difference for burnout of the 4-H youth development professionals at the six LGUs [$F(5, 154) = 2.32$, $p = 0.046$]. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated that there were no means for this job responsibility that had a significant difference below the $p < .05$ level.

Table 44 is a comparison of mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference, based on Tukey's post hoc test results, within the volunteerism domain for job responsibility #4 "provide educational opportunities for volunteers." Those results indicated that the mean OSU score was significantly greater than WSU ($p = 0.040$).

Table 44. Building Relationships for Burnout of Volunteerism Domain Job Responsibility #3[a] Between Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Oregon State University (OSU)	31	2.52	1.26	**OSU-WSU**	**0.91**	**0.040**
Washington State University (WSU)	18	1.61	0.61			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]job responsibility #3: provide educational opportunities for volunteers.

There was a significant difference found within the organizational management domain's reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #1 "develop and support both local and state policies and procedures": $F(5, 138) = 2.54$, $p = 0.031$. Table 45 is a comparison of mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference, based on Tukey's post hoc test results, for job responsibility #1. Those results indicated that the mean UW score was significantly greater than WSU ($p = 0.038$) and CSU ($p = 0.040$). Table 45 also has a comparison of mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference, based on Tukey's post hoc test results, for the organizational management domain's job responsibility #4 "work with volunteers and colleagues in risk management." Those results indicated that the mean UI score was significantly lower than UW ($p = 0.030$).

Table 45. Building Relationships for Burnout of Organizational Management Domain Job Responsibilities #1[a] and #4[b] Between Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Job Responsibility #1[a]						
Washington State University (WSU)	17	2.12	1.22	**WSU-UW**	**1.48**	**0.038**
Colorado State University (CSU)	24	2.21	0.98	**CSU-UW**	**1.39**	**0.040**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	3.60	1.27			
Job Responsibility #4[b]						
University of Idaho (UI)	40	1.95	1.09	**UI-UW**	**1.15**	**0.030**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	3.10	0.99			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]job responsibility #1: develop and support both local and state policy and procedures. [b]job responsibility #4: work with volunteers and colleagues in risk management.

Primary Job Title Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the degree of burnout for the 4-H PRKC domain job responsibilities of the nine primary job title groups of 4-H youth development professionals. There was a significant difference within the responses for the youth development domain's job responsibility #7 "deal with conflict management issues": $F(8, 188) = 3.82$, $p > 0.001$. Table 46 is a comparison of mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test results. Those results indicated that the mean score for the group of CEEs was significantly greater than the CPAs ($p = 0.009$) and the SSs ($p = 0.048$).

Table 46. Building Relationships for Burnout of Youth Development Domain Job Responsibility #7[a] Between Primary Job Title Groups with $p < .05$

Primary Job Title	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
County Program Assistants (CPA)	13	2.23	1.17	**CPA-CEE**	**1.288**	**0.009**
County Extension Educator (CEE)	106	3.52	1.24	**CEE-SS**	**1.297**	**0.048**
State Specialist (SS)	9	2.22	1.31			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]job responsibility #7: deal with conflict management issues.

Job responsibility #4 "provide performance feedback to volunteers" within the volunteerism domain had a significant difference for burnout: $F(8, 150) = 2.35$, $p = 0.021$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated there were no means for this job responsibility that had a significant difference below the $p < .05$ level.

The results for job responsibility #5 "recognizing volunteers" within the volunteerism domain had a significant difference for burnout: $F(8, 151) = 2.37$, $p = 0.020$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated there were no means for this job responsibility that had a significant difference below the $p < .05$ level.

When the ANOVA test was conducted, job responsibility #1 "develop and support both local and state policies and procedures" within the organizational management domain had a significant difference for burnout: $F(8, 135) = 2.11$, $p = 0.039$. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated that there were no means for this job responsibility that had a significant difference below the $p < .05$ level.

There was a significant difference within the organizational management domain's burnout for job responsibility #7 "involvement in professional associations": $F(8, 132) = 2.22$, $p = 0.030$. Table 47 denotes a comparison of mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test results. Those results indicated that the mean score for the group of AEEs was significantly greater than both the SPL ($p = 0.046$) and the OTH ($p = 0.013$) groups.

Table 47. Building Relationships for Burnout of Organizational Management Domain Job Responsibility #7[a] Between Primary Job Title Groups with $p < .05$

Primary Job Title	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Area Extension Educator (AEE)	4	3.00	0.82	**AEE-SPL**	**2.00**	**0.046**
State Program Leaders (SPL)	4	1.00	0.00	**AEE-OTH**	**2.00**	**0.013**
Other Job Titles (OTH)	7	1.00	0.00			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]job responsibility #7: involved in professional associations.

County Extension Educators by Land-Grant University Groups

Within the youth program development domain for job responsibility #1 "use research and citizen perspective for program ideas," the ANOVA results indicated a significant difference for burnout for the CEEs grouped by LGU: $F(5, 88) = 2.64$, $p = 0.028$. The Tukey's post hoc test results conveyed that there were no means for this job responsibility that had a significant difference below the $p < .05$ level.

Table 48 shows a comparison of mean differences for those CEEs by LGU that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test results. Those results indicated that the mean score for the group of CEEs from the OSU was significantly greater than the CEEs at WSU ($p = 0.022$).

Table 48. Building Relationships for Burnout of Volunteerism Domain Job Responsibility #3[a] Between County Extension Educators by Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*p*
Oregon State University (OSU)	17	2.65	1.27	**OSU-WSU**	**1.40**	**0.022**
Washington State University (WSU)	8	1.25	0.46			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]job responsibility #3: provide educational opportunities to volunteers.

Table 49 is a comparison of the mean differences for those CEEs by LGU that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test results. Those results indicated that the mean score for the group of CEEs from WSU was significantly lower than the CEEs from UW ($p = 0.046$).

Table 49. Building Relationships for Burnout of Organizational Management Domain Job Responsibility #1[a] Between County Extension Educators by Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*P*
Washington State University (WSU)	8	1.63	0.92	**WSU-UW**	**2.04**	**0.046**
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	3.67	1.03			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]statement #1: developing and supporting both state and local policies and procedures.

Burnout Survey Results

Burnout is related to one's emotional exhaustion and behavior (Borritz & Kristensen, 2004), so similar to the JSS, the results are calculated based on the professional's attitude towards the job. The burnout scale was *1 = agree very much, 2 =*

agree moderately, 3 = *agree slightly*, 4 = *disagree slightly*, 5 = *disagree moderately*, and 6 = *disagree very much*. A score of 0.00 to 2.99 denoted that the employee had very little to no burnout; a score of 3.00 to 4.99 indicated a slight degree for burnout; and a score of 5.00 to 5.99 implied the employee was experiencing burnout.

Table 50 is a compilation of the descriptive statistic results for the burnout survey and each item within the burnout survey for the overall group of research respondents. The overall burnout for the 4-H youth development professionals who participated in the study was 3.84 (SD = 0.86). There were 13 statements that had a mean between 1.00 and 2.99. There were 30 statements that had a mean between 3.00 and 4.99, and 2 statements had a mean between 5.00 and 5.99. Item #22 "I feel that I am in the wrong organization or wrong profession" had the greatest level of disagreement (M = 5.04, SD = 1.40) with the statement. Item #38 "my work is meaningful" had the greatest level of agreement (M = 1.79, SD = 1.15).

ANOVA-Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results for Burnout Survey Results

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare the results of statements from the burnout survey for each of the land-grant university (LGU) groups, primary job title (PJT) groups, and CEEs by LGU groups. The post hoc test, Tukey's HSD, was conducted to determine which groups had differences. An alpha level of $p < .05$ was used to determine the significance. Some reported facet ANOVA results had p values over the significance level of .05. When the Tukey tests were conducted during the ANOVA tests, the results had differences between some groups below the $p < .05$ level. Those results are reported along with those that were below the $p < .05$ level.

Table 50. Descriptive Statistic Results of the Burnout Survey for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	Burnout Survey Descriptive			Frequency Percentage					
Burnout Survey Item	*N*	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. I am tired of trying.	144	4.10	1.50	6.9	5.6	26.4	16.0	22.2	22.9
2. I get emotionally involved in my work.	138	2.18	1.17	34.1	31.2	23.9	6.5	2.2	2.2
3. I lack initiative.	140	5.02	1.08	0.0	2.1	10.0	13.6	32.1	42.1
4. I feel my work is always unfinished or unending.	144	2.42	1.38	31.9	25.7	25.7	4.9	8.3	3.5
5. I am not as healthy as I should be.	143	3.08	1.70	22.4	21.7	20.3	9.8	13.3	12.6
6. I feel misunderstood or unappreciated by my co-workers.	142	4.11	1.57	7.7	7.0	23.9	14.8	20.4	26.1
7. I often think: "I can't do this anymore."	144	3.86	1.63	11.1	11.1	18.8	20.1	17.4	21.5
8. I believe I can cope with most situations in my life.	144	1.87	0.99	41.0	41.0	12.5	2.8	1.4	1.4
9. I feel worn out at the end of the working day.	144	2.54	1.15	20.8	26.4	39.6	5.6	6.3	1.4
10. I feel "defeated like I'm up against a brick wall."	144	3.82	1.50	8.3	10.4	25.7	18.1	21.5	16.0
11. I feel that what I do in my daily life is meaningful.	144	2.03	1.14	39.6	34.0	16.7	4.9	3.5	1.4
12. I worry about losing my job.	143	3.67	1.54	6.3	18.9	26.6	16.8	12.6	18.9
13. I am able to talk or be social with my colleagues while I am at work.	144	2.24	1.35	36.1	31.9	17.4	6.3	3.5	4.9
14. I tend to be prone to negative thinking about my job.	143	4.28	1.40	2.8	9.1	17.5	23.8	21.7	25.2
15. I am often emotionally exhausted.	143	3.16	1.47	14.0	22.4	26.6	14.7	15.4	7.0
16. No matter what I do, things on the job don't seem to get any better.	140	3.97	1.38	8.6	5.0	17.9	30.0	26.4	12.1
17. I have influence on what I do at work.	144	2.07	1.17	36.1	39.6	13.2	5.6	3.5	2.1
18. I have not had time to relax or enjoy myself.	142	3.11	1.48	16.9	21.1	21.8	21.1	12.7	6.3
19. Temporarily removing myself from the job seems to resolve my feelings.	143	3.14	1.16	5.6	24.5	37.1	18.9	11.2	2.8
20. I often feel run down and drained of physical energy.	143	3.03	1.43	16.1	21.0	29.4	17.5	9.1	7.0
21. I am tired of working with 4-H clients, including members and volunteers.	144	4.69	1.38	4.2	4.2	8.3	22.9	22.2	38.2
22. I feel that I am in the wrong organization or the wrong profession.	144	5.04	1.41	4.9	2.1	8.3	10.4	17.4	56.9
23. I seem to get sick a little easier than other people.	143	4.71	1.33	1.4	5.6	12.6	20.3	21.0	39.2
24. I find it harder to be sympathetic with people.	141	4.28	1.35	2.8	7.8	18.4	22.7	26.2	22.0
25. I am frustrated with parts of my job.	143	2.68	1.37	22.4	25.9	30.8	7.7	9.1	4.2
26. My work is emotionally demanding.	140	2.57	1.13	16.4	35.7	30.7	9.3	7.1	0.7

Table 50. (Continued)

Burnout Survey Item	Burnout Survey Descriptive			Frequency Percentage					
	N	*M*[a]	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I feel motivated and involved in my work.	143	2.30	1.11	23.8	42.0	21.7	6.3	5.6	0.7
28. In the past 4 weeks, I have had a hard time concentrating at work.	143	3.40	1.48	9.8	18.2	32.2	14.0	14.0	11.9
29. I am physically exhausted more than 3 days a week.	143	3.60	1.66	11.9	19.6	16.1	20.3	13.3	18.9
30. I find myself getting easily irritated by small problems, or by my co-workers, or 4-H clientele.	142	3.93	1.47	9.2	7.0	19.7	24.6	24.6	14.8
31. I no longer have enough time to attend to my family or personal needs.	142	3.30	1.49	14.8	14.1	29.6	18.3	14.1	9.2
32. I find it harder to go to work in the mornings or taking more sick days than usual with little reason.	142	4.49	1.42	3.5	6.3	14.1	23.9	18.3	33.8
33. I feel there is little support from fellow workers.	143	4.22	1.53	7.0	9.8	11.9	21.7	25.2	24.5
34. I feel there is more work to do than I have the ability to do.	142	2.58	1.39	28.2	22.5	26.1	12.7	7.0	3.5
35. I feel disillusioned and resentful about the people with whom I work with (4-H volunteers and/or members).	143	4.70	1.34	3.5	3.5	13.3	13.3	32.2	34.3
36. I often achieve less than I know I should.	143	3.66	1.44	7.0	14.0	28.7	18.9	18.9	12.6
37. I receive all of the information that I need in order to do my work well.	143	3.27	1.24	4.2	28.7	25.2	23.8	14.7	3.5
38. My work is meaningful.	142	1.79	1.15	52.1	31.7	9.9	1.4	1.4	3.5
39. I feel that I give more than I get back when I work with clients.	143	3.15	1.39	11.9	23.1	27.3	19.6	11.9	6.3
40. I often get behind in my work.	142	2.99	1.36	13.4	27.5	27.5	14.8	12.7	4.2
Overall Burnout Survey Results		3.84	0.86						

Note: burnout survey scale: 1 = agree very much; 2 = agree moderately; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = disagree slightly; 5 = disagree moderately; and 6 = disagree very much. [a]burnout is measured by the following scale: *M* = 2.99 and below showed very little to no burnout; *M* = 3.00 to 4.99 showed a slight degree of burnout; and *M* = 5.00 and above showed burnout.

For the burnout survey, there were some ANOVA results that had p values over the significance level of .05. When the Tukey tests were conducted at the same time as the ANOVA tests, the results revealed differences between some groups below the $p < .05$ level. For these items, the Tukey procedure results are reported.

Land-Grant University Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare burnout for the six individual land-grant university (LGU) groups. There were three statements that showed significant differences in the burnout survey for the LGU groups. Statement #2 "I get emotionally involved in my work" showed a significant difference of $F(5, 132) = 3.06$, $p = 0.012$.

Table 51 shows a comparison of mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test results. Those results indicated that the burnout survey statement #2 mean score for WSU was significantly greater than UW ($p = 0.033$). There was a significant difference for statement #6 "I feel my work is always unfinished and unending" [$F(5, 136) = 2.42$, $p = 0.039$]. Table 51 is a comparison of mean differences for those LGUs that had a significant difference based on Tukey's post hoc test results. Those results indicated that the burnout survey statement #6 mean score for UW was significantly lower than from both UI ($p = 0.042$) and CSU ($p = 0.018$). For burnout survey statement #12 (I worry about losing my job), there was a significant difference: $F(5, 137) = 5.95$, $p < 0.001$. The Tukey test results indicated that for this statement, the mean score for UW was significantly greater than OSU ($p = 0.021$), WSU ($p < 0.001$), MSU ($p = 0.001$), and CSU ($p < 0.001$).

Primary Job Title Groups

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the statements from the burnout survey for the nine primary job title groups of 4-H youth development professionals. There were four statements within the burnout survey that showed a significant difference for the nine groups of 4-H youth development professionals categorized by primary job title, and the comparison of the mean differences between the groups are reported in Table 52.

Table 51. Building Relationships for the Burnout Survey Statement Means Between Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*[a,b]	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*P*
Burnout Survey Item #2[c]						
Washington State University (WSU)	17	2.76	1.25	**WSU-UW**	**1.37**	**0.033**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	1.40	0.52			
Burnout Survey Item #6[d]						
University of Idaho (UI)	39	4.31	1.40	**UI-UW**	**1.61**	**0.042**
Colorado State University (CSU)	25	4.56	1.50	**CSU-UW**	**1.86**	**0.018**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	2.70	1.77			
Burnout Survey Item #12[e]						
Oregon State University (OSU)	25	3.80	1.32	**OSU-UW**	**1.70**	**0.021**
Washington State University (WSU)	17	2.88	1.41	**WSU-UW**	**2.62**	**0.000**
Montana State University (MSU)	27	3.26	1.53	**MSU-UW**	**2.24**	**0.001**
Colorado State University (CSU)	25	3.20	1.44	**CSU-UW**	**2.30**	**0.000**
University of Wyoming (UW)	10	5.50	0.71			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]burnout survey scale: 1 = agree very much; 2 = agree moderately; 3 = agree slightly; 4 disagree slightly; 5 = disagree moderately; and 6 = disagree very much. [b]burnout is measured by the following scale: *M* = 2.99 and below showed very little to no burnout; *M* = 3.00 to 4.99 showed slight degree of burnout; and *M* = 5.00 and above showed burnout. [c]item #2: I get emotionally involved in my work. [d]item #6: I feel misunderstood or unappreciated by my co-workers. [e]item #12: I worry about losing my job.

There was a significant difference for burnout survey statement #4 "I feel my work is always unfinished and unending" [$F(8, 135) = 2.21$, $p = 0.031$]. The Tukey's post hoc test results indicated that the burnout survey statement #2 mean score for CPAs was significantly greater than the CEEs ($p = 0.016$). Burnout survey statement #10 "I feel defeated like I am up against a brick wall" was significant different for burnout: $F(8, 135) = 2.08$, $p = 0.042$. The post hoc Tukey HSD test results revealed that the mean score for CPAs was significantly greater than the CPCs ($p = 0.026$). There was a significant difference for burnout survey statement #26 "my work is emotionally demanding": $F(8, 131) = 3.11$, $p = 0.003$. The Tukey post hoc test indicated that the mean score for the CPAs was significantly greater than both the CPCs ($p = 0.036$) and CEEs ($p = 0.008$). The final significant difference for this group in the burnout survey was statement #34 "I feel there is more work to do than I have the ability to do" [$F(8, 133) = 2.16$, $p = 0.035$]. The Tukey

post hoc test results indicated the mean for the CPAs was significantly greater than the CEEs ($p = 0.042$).

Statement #12 "I worry about losing my job" had a significant difference of $F(8, 134) = 2.44$, $p = 0.017$. When the post hoc Tukey HSD test was conducted, there were no pairs of 4-H youth development professionals who were significantly different.

Table 52. Building Relationships for the Burnout Survey Statement Means Between Primary Job Title Groups with $p < .05$

Primary Job Title	*N*	*M*[a,b]	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*P*
Burnout Survey Item #4[c]						
County Program Assistant (CPA)	11	3.64	1.29	**CPA-CEE**	**1.53**	**0.016**
County Extension Educator (CEE)	75	2.11	1.21			
Burnout Survey Item #10[d]						
County Program Assistant (CPA)	11	5.09	1.04	**CPA-CPC**	**1.82**	**0.026**
County Program Coordinator (CPC)	22	3.27	1.35			
Burnout Survey Item #26[e]						
County Program Assistant (CPA)	11	3.64	1.43	**CPA-CPC**	**1.30**	**0.036**
County Program Coordinator (CPC)	21	2.33	1.02	**CPA-CEE**	**1.29**	**0.008**
County Extension Educator (CEE)	73	2.34	1.03			
Burnout Survey Item #34[f]						
County Program Assistant (CPA)	11	3.64	1.36	**CPA-CEE**	**1.39**	**0.042**
County Extension Educator (CEE)	74	2.24	1.29			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]burnout survey scale: 1 = agree very much; 2 = agree moderately; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = disagree slightly; 5 = disagree moderately; and 6 = disagree very much. [b]burnout is measured by the following scale: $M = 2.99$ and below showed very little to no burnout; $M = 3.00$ to 4.99 showed a slight degree of burnout; and $M = 5.00$ and above showed burnout. [c]item #4: I feel my work is always unfinished or unending. [d]item #10: I feel "defeated like I'm up against a brick wall." [e]item #26: My work is emotionally draining. [f]item #34: I feel there is more work to do than I have the ability to do so.

County Extension Educators by Land-Grant University Groups

There were two burnout survey statements that were significantly different for the CEEs grouped by LGU, and the comparison of the mean differences between the groups is reported in Table 53. Within burnout survey statement #2 "I get emotionally involved in my work," the ANOVA results were significantly different: $F(5, 66) = 4.09$, $p = 0.003$. The

Tukey post hoc test results indicated that the mean for the WSU CEEs was significantly greater than the CEEs from both OSU ($p = 0.021$) and UW ($p = 0.025$). The mean scores of the OSU CEEs were significantly lower than MSU ($p = 0.032$).

There was a significant difference for statement #12 "I worry about losing my job": $F(5, 69) = 7.46$, $p < 0.001$. The Tukey post hoc test indicated that the mean for the WSU CEEs was significantly lower than the CEEs from UI ($p = 0.005$), OSU ($p = 0.011$), and UW ($p < 0.001$). The mean score for the UW CEEs was significantly greater than the CEEs from both MSU ($p = 0.001$) and CSU ($p = 0.001$).

Table 53. Building Relationships for the Burnout Survey Statement Means Between County Extension Educators Aggregated by Land-Grant University Groups with $p < .05$

LGU	*N*	*M*[a,b]	*SD*	Pairs	Paired Difference	*P*
Burnout Survey Item #2[c]						
Oregon State University (OSU)	15	1.60	0.63	**OSU-WSU**	**1.28**	**0.021**
Washington State University (WSU)	8	2.87	1.13	**OSU-MSU**	**0.95**	**0.032**
Montana State University (MSU)	20	2.55	1.10	**WSU-UW**	**1.54**	**0.025**
Colorado State University (CSU)	10	2.00	0.94			
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	1.33	0.52			
Burnout Survey Item #12[d]						
University of Idaho (UI)	15	4.00	1.41	**UI-WSU**	**2.13**	**0.005**
Oregon State University (OSU)	15	3.87	1.41	**OSU-WSU**	**1.99**	**0.011**
Washington State University (WSU)	8	1.88	0.84	**WSU-UW**	**3.79**	**0.000**
Montana State University (MSU)	20	3.05	1.43	**MSU-UW**	**2.62**	**0.001**
Colorado State University (CSU)	11	2.82	1.33	**CSU-UW**	**2.85**	**0.001**
University of Wyoming (UW)	6	5.67	0.52			

Note. $p < .05$. [a]burnout survey scale: 1 = agree very much; 2 = agree moderately; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = disagree slightly; 5 = disagree moderately; and 6 = disagree very much. [b]burnout is measured by the following scale: $M = 2.99$ and below showed very little to no burnout; $M = 3.00$ to 4.99 showed a slight degree of burnout; and $M = 5.00$ and above showed burnout. [c]item #2: I get emotionally involved in my work. [d]item #12: I worry about losing my job.

Burnout survey statement #26 "my work is emotionally draining" showed a significant difference of $F(8, 67) = 2.37$, $p = 0.049$. When the post hoc Tukey HSD test

was conducted, there were no pairs of 4-H youth development professionals that showed a significant difference.

Self-Reported Burnout Results

The research participants were asked to report on a scale of 1 to 5 (*1 = to a very small degree* and *5 = to a very large degree*) their level of burnout related to the job. The self-reported level of burnout (n = 141) had 41.1% of the respondents reporting a very small or small degree of burnout with their current job. There were 34.0% of the respondents who reported being somewhat burned out with their job. The final 24.8% of the survey respondents reported a large or very large degree of job burnout. The self-reported burnout mean for the overall group of 4-H youth development professional participants was 2.75 (SD = 1.17).

Correlation Results

The research questions for this study asked if there were a correlation between workload and job satisfaction, as well as burnout of 4-H youth development professionals. To determine if there is a correlation, a Pearson-product correlation co-efficient test was conducted to assess the relationship between the variables. The text will discuss those correlation results that had a weak to strong relationship and had a p value < .05. The definitions used to describe the level of relationship between variables for all of the correlation results were as follows:

- A strong relationship: r is between .500 and 1.00 or between -.500 and -1.00;
- A moderate relationship: r is between .300 and .500 or between -.300 and -.500;
- A weak relationship: r is between .100 and .300 or between -.100 and -.300;
- Little to no relationship: r is between .000 and .100 or between .000 and -.100.

4-H PRKC Domain Results

The correlation results for the 4-H PRKC domains are given in Table 54. All six domains had a strong, positive relationship between the percentage of actual work time spent and the percentage of work time that should be spent in each of the 4-H PRKC domains. The youth development, youth program development, and organizational management domains all revealed a negative, weak relationship between the percentage of work time actually spent and the level of job satisfaction for that domain. The youth development domain (r = -.175, n = 202, p < .05) and youth program development domain (r = -.142, n = 200, p < .05) had negative, weak relationships between the percentage of actual time spent and the level of job satisfaction while the organizational management domain had a positive, weak relationship (r = .242, n = 194, p < .01) between the two variables.

Correlation Results for Workload and Job Satisfaction

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between the workload (determined by rank-order mean for individual job responsibilities) and job satisfaction. In the study, there were several variables used to measure a 4-H youth development professional's level of job satisfaction. The variables used to measure job satisfaction were as follows:

- Self-reported level of job satisfaction related to each of the six 4-H PRKC domains.
- Self-reported level of job satisfaction related to each of the seven job responsibilities within the six 4-H PRKC domains.
- Job Satisfaction Survey (overall JSS score used).

- Self-reported overall level of job satisfaction for the current job (not related to any specific job responsibility or the 4-H PRKC).

Table 54. Pearson Product Correlation Results for 4-H PRKC Domains' Percentage of Time Actually Spent, Percentage of Time that Should Be Spent, Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction, and Self-Reported Domain Burnout for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4
1. Youth Development Domain: Time Actually Spent		--			
2. Youth Development Domain: Time Should Be Spent		.764**	--		
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	202	-.175*	-.131	--	
4. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	189	.303**	.239**	.131	--
1. Youth Program Development Domain: Actually Spent		--			
2. Youth Program Development Domain: Time Should Be Spent		.781**	--		
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	200	-.142*	-.102	--	
4. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	191	.245**	.184**	.174*	--
1. Volunteerism Domain: Time Actually Spent		--			
2. Volunteerism Domain: Time Should Be Spent		.747**	--		
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	197	.003	-.047	--	
4. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	193	.114	.042	.424**	--
1. Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain: Time Actually Spent		--			
2. Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain: Time Should Be Spent		.694**	--		
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	190	-.001	.096	--	
4. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	177	.198**	.220**	.334**	--
1. Partnership Domain: Time Actually Spent		--			
2. Partnership Domain: Time Should Be Spent		.645**	--		
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	192	-.013	.017	--	
4. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	178	.181**	.141*	.340**	--
1. Organizational Management Domain: Time Actually Spent		--			
2. Organizational Management Domain: Time Should Be Spent		.575**	--		
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	194	.242**	-.019	--	
4. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	185	.347**	.127	.518**	--

Note. **Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); *Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed); 1 = Individual 4-H PRKC Domain-Time Actually Spent, 2 = Individual 4-H PRKC Domain Time Should Be Spent, 3 = Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction, and 4 = Self-Reported Domain Burnout.

The definitions used to describe the level of relationship between variables for all of the correlation results were as follows:

- A strong relationship: *r* is between .500 and 1.00 or between -.500 and -1.00;

- A moderate relationship: r is between .300 and .500 or between -.300 and -.500;
- A weak relationship: r is between .100 and .300 or between -.100 and -.300;
- Little to no relationship: r is between .000 and .100 or between .000 and -.100.

Youth development domain. Table 55 shows the correlation between workload and job satisfaction for the youth development domain. There were six pairs of variables that had a moderate to strong relationship within the youth development domain.

The rank order and level of job satisfaction for job responsibility #2 "creating programs" had a strong, positive relationship (r = .505, n = 200, p < .05). The first moderately positive relationship was between the rank order and the level of job satisfaction (r = .327, n = 200, p < .05) for job responsibility #3 "project area opportunities." There was a moderate, positive relationship between job satisfaction for job responsibility #2 "create programs" and the self-reported level of job satisfaction for the youth development domain (r = .409, n = 205, p < .05). There was a moderate, positive relationship between job satisfaction for job responsibility #3 "project area opportunities" and the self-reported job satisfaction for the youth development domain (r = .386, n = 205, p < .05). There was a moderate, positive relationship between job satisfaction for job responsibility #3 and the overall self-reported level of job satisfaction (r = .355, n = 145, p < .05). A moderate, positive relationship was found between job satisfaction for job responsibility #5 "life skills" and the domain's self-reported level of job satisfaction (r = .461, n = 205, p < .05). The final moderate, positive relationship for the youth development domain was between the overall Job Satisfaction Survey score and the self-reported level of job satisfaction for the youth development domain (r = .308, p < .05).

Table 55. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Youth Development Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Survey, and Self-Reported Job Satisfaction for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Professional Development	201	---				
2. J.S. Level: Professional Development	200	.093	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.017	.183**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.032	-.031	.007	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.010	.051	.308**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Create Programs	201	---				
2. J.S. Level: Create Programs	200	.505**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.262**	.409**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.020	-.053	.007	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.145	.247**	.308**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Project Area Opportunities	201	---				
2. J.S. Level: Project Area Opportunities	200	.327**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.114	.386**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.135	-.010	.007	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.138	.355**	.308**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Positive Relationships	201	---				
2. J.S. Level: Positive Relationships	200	.218**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.083	.246**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.125	-.102	.007	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.103	.154	.308**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Positive Behaviors	201	---				
2. J.S. Level: Positive Behaviors	200	.071	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.078	.286**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.044	-.036	.007	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.014	.105	.308**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Life Skills	201	---				
2. J.S. Level: Life Skills	200	.138	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.023	.461**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.087	-.022	.007	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.017	.270**	.308**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Conflict Management	201	---				
2. J.S. Level: Conflict Management	200	-.123	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.233**	.213**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.037	-.098	.007	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.141	.174*	.308**	-.074	---

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
The abbreviation of J.S. stands for Job Satisfaction; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility in Youth Development Domain, 2 = Job Satisfaction of Individual Job Responsibility in the youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Job Satisfaction, 4 = Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Job Satisfaction.

Youth program development domain. Table 56 is the correlation between the workload and job satisfaction variables within the youth program development domain. There were five correlations which were moderately related in the domain. The rank order and job satisfaction for job responsibility #3 "community partners" had a moderate, positive relationship ($r = .352$, $n = 145$, $p < .05$). The overall level of job satisfaction and the job satisfaction for the youth program development domain variables ($r = .303$, $n = 145$, $p < .05$) had a moderately positive relationship. Another moderately positive relationship ($r = .346$, $n = 175$, $p < .05$) was revealed between the rank order and the job satisfaction variables for job responsibility #1 "use research and citizen perspective for program planning." A positive, moderate relationship was found between job satisfaction for job responsibility #6 "evaluate programs and communicate the results" and the job satisfaction reported for the youth program development domain ($r = .318$, $n = 205$, $p < .05$). The final positive, moderate relationship in the youth program development domain ($r = .349$, $n = 175$, $p < .01$) was found between the rank order and job satisfaction for job responsibility #7 "working with design teams to plan programs."

Volunteerism domain. Table 57 shows the correlation results for the workload and job-satisfaction variables in the volunteerism domain. There were only two correlation results within the volunteerism domain that had a moderate relationship. The variables of the rank order and job satisfaction for job responsibility #3 "providing educational opportunities" had a moderate, positive relationship ($r = .308$, $n = 162$, $p < .05$). The other moderately positive relationship was found between the job satisfaction for job responsibility #3 and the self-reported level of job satisfaction for the volunteerism domain ($r = .304$, $n = 205$, $p < .05$).

Table 56. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Youth Program Development Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Survey, and Self-Reported Job Satisfaction for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Use Research	175	---				
2. J.S. Level: Use Research	175	.346**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.057	.209**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.045	.013	-.122	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.047	.124	.303**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Advocate with Advisory Boards	175	---				
2. J.S. Level: Advocate with Advisory Boards	175	.220**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.115	.201**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.029	-.122	-.122	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.042	.273**	.303**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Community Partners	175	---				
2. J.S. Level: Community Partners	175	.352**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.043	.145	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.065	.063	-.122	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.122	.056	.303**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Planning Programs	175	---				
2. J.S. Level: Planning Programs	175	.207**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.072	.254**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.132	-.030	-.122	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.147	.262**	.303**	-.074	---
1. Rank: 4-H Curriculum	175	---				
2. J.S. Level: 4-H Curriculum	175	.256**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.033	.148	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.068	.065	-.122	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.194*	.158	.303**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Evaluate Programs	175	---				
2. J.S. Level: Evaluate Programs	175	.164*	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.066	.318**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.054	-.148	-.122	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.026	.079	.303**	-.074	---
1. Rank: Design Teams	175	---				
2. J.S. Level: Design Teams	175	.349*	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.132	.209**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.023	-.172	-.122	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.003	.066	.303**	-.074	

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation of J.S. stands for Job Satisfaction: 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility in Youth Development Domain, 2 = Job Satisfaction of Individual Job Responsibility in the youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Job Satisfaction, 4 = Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Job Satisfaction.

Table 57. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Volunteerism Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Survey, and Self-Reported Job Satisfaction for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Use Volunteer Committees	162	---				
2. J.S. Level: Use Volunteer Committees	162	.237**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.040	.217**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.081	.038	-.168*		
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.027	.260**	.173*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Volunteer Selection Process	162	---				
2. J.S. Level: Vol. Selection Process	162	.117	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.068	.233**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.011	-.035	-.168*		
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.015	.151	.173*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Educational Opportunities	162	---				
2. J.S. Level: Educational Opportunities	162	.308**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.110	.304**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.177*	-.045	-.168*		
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.031	.042	.173*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Provide Feedback	162	---				
2. J.S. Level: Provide Feedback	162	.152	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.089	.278**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.034	-.080	-.168*		
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.163	.098	.173*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Recognize Volunteers	162	---				
2. J.S. Level: Recognize Volunteers	162	.154	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.045	.125	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.125	-.036	-.168*		
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.047	.128	.173*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Written Position Descriptions	162	---				
2. J.S. Level: Written Position Descriptions	162	.263**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.008	.164*	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.098	-.127	-.168*		
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.055	.223**	.173*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Recruit Volunteers	162	---				
2. J.S. Level: Recruit Volunteers	162	.091	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.117	.222**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.031	-.142	-.168*		
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.024	.292**	.173*	-.074	

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation of J.S. stands for Job Satisfaction; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility in Youth Development Domain, 2 = Job Satisfaction of Individual Job Responsibility in the youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Job Satisfaction, 4 = Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Job Satisfaction.

Equity, access, and opportunity domain. Table 58 includes the correlations between the workload and job satisfaction variables in the equity, access, and opportunity domain. There were three correlation results for job satisfaction variables which revealed a positive, moderate relationship. A moderately positive relationship ($r = .358$, $n = 158$, $p < .05$) was found for the variables of rank order and job satisfaction for job responsibility #1 "building community relationships."

There was a moderate, positive relationship was found between job satisfaction for job responsibility #7 "develop materials for diverse audiences" and the self-reported level of job satisfaction for the equity, access, and opportunity domain ($r = .0318$, $n = 205$, $p < .05$). There was a moderate, positive relationship between job satisfaction for job responsibility #3 "recruit diverse volunteers" and the self-reported level of job satisfaction for the equity, access, and opportunity domain ($r = .306$, $n = 205$, $p < .05$).

Partnership domain. The correlation results for the partnership domain are given in Table 59. The variables measuring workload and job satisfaction demonstrated a moderately positive relationship ($r = .322$, $n = 153$, $p < .05$) between the rank order and job satisfaction for job responsibility #1 "facilitating youth on 4-H boards and committees" variables.

Organizational management domain. Table 60 includes the results for the organizational management domain correlations. The correlations between variables measuring workload and job satisfaction were moderately related positively ($r = .400$, $n = 146$, $p < .05$) between the rank order and job satisfaction for job responsibility #6 "conducting research."

Table 58. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Survey, and Self-Reported Job Satisfaction for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Build Community Relationships	158	---				
2. J.S. Level: Build Community Relationships	158	.358**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.075	.254**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.089	-.054	-.083	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.132	.120	.165*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Marketing Programs	158	---				
2. J.S. Level: Marketing Programs	158	.116	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.061	.193*	----		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.029	-.197*	-.083	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.005	.163*	.165*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Recruit Diverse Volunteers	158	---				
2. J.S. Level: Recruit Diverse Volunteers	158	.141	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.065	.306**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.062	-.074	-.083	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.061	.275**	.165*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Diversity on Advisory Boards	158	---				
2. J.S. Level: Diversity on Advisory Boards	158	.090	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.079	.266**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.071	-.180*	-.083	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.189*	.259**	.165*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Diversity in Programs	158	---				
2. J.S. Level: Diversity in Programs	158	.148	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.148	.166*	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.055	-.067	-.083	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.018	.202*	.165*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Training	158	---				
2. J.S. Level: Training	158	.199*	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.053	.247**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.099	-.023	-.083	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.023	.202*	.165*	-.074	---
1. Rank: Develop Materials	158	---				
2. J.S. Level: Develop Materials	158	.228**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.158	.318**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.113	-.155	-.083	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.043	.177*	.165*	-.074	

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation of J.S. stands for Job Satisfaction; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility in Youth Development Domain, 2 = Job Satisfaction of Individual Job Responsibility in the youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Job Satisfaction, 4 = Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Job Satisfaction.

Table 59. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Partnership Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Survey, and Self-Reported Job Satisfaction for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Facilitate on 4-H Boards	153	---				
2. J.S. Level: Facilitate on 4-H Boards	153	.322**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.018	.037	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.157	.004	-.092	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.091	.131	.056	-.074	---
1. Rank: Advocate for Youth	153	---				
2. J.S. Level: Advocate for Youth	153	.228**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.070	.237**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.018	.028	-.092	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.025	.096	.056	-.074	---
1. Rank: Youth Lead	153	---				
2. J.S. Level: Youth Lead	153	.080	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.052	-.027	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.007	-.021	-.092	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.115	-.009	.056	-.074	---
1. Rank: Community Coalitions	153	---				
2. J.S. Level: Community Coalitions	153	.254**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.004	.190*	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.031	-.062	-.092	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.031	.044	.056	-.074	---
1. Rank: Work-Force Skills	153	---				
2. J.S. Level: Work-Force Skills	153	.298**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.078	-.038	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.175*	-.006	-.092	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.071	.120	.056	-.074	---
1. Rank: Youth in Community Change	153	---				
2. J.S. Level: Youth in Community Change	153	.233**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.101	.075	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.061	.011	-.092	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.009	.171*	.056	-.074	---
1. Rank: Work with Current Boards	153	---				
2. J.S. Level: Work with Current Boards	153	.184*	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.136	.048	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.121	-.052	-.092	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.203*	-.019	.056	-.074	---

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation of J.S. stands for Job Satisfaction; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility in Youth Development Domain, 2 = Job Satisfaction of Individual Job Responsibility in the youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Job Satisfaction, 4 = Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Job Satisfaction.

There were three additional data points within the organizational management domain that had a moderate relationship. A positive relationship was found between job satisfaction for job responsibility #4 "risk management" and the overall level of job satisfaction ($r = .329$, $n = 145$, $p < .05$). A positive relationship was found between job satisfaction for job responsibility # 5 "financial management" and the overall level of job satisfaction ($r = .319$, $n = 145$, $p < .05$). The last positive relationship ($r = .357$, $n = 146$, $p < .05$) within the organizational management domain was found between the rank order and job-satisfaction variables for job responsibility #7 "involvement in professional associations."

Correlation Results for Workload and Burnout

Correlations between workload (as determined by the rank order of the job responsibilities in the 4-H PRKC) and burnout are discussed in this section. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between the workload and burnout variables. Through the study, there were several variables used to measure the 4-H Youth Development professionals' degree of burnout.

The four variables used in the correlation that measured burnout were as follows:

- Self-reported level of burnout related to each of the six 4-H PRKC domains.
- Self-reported level of burnout related to each of the seven job responsibilities within the six 4-H PRKC domains.
- Overall score from the burnout survey.
- Self-reported overall level of burnout for the current job (not related to any specific job responsibility or the 4-H PRKC).

Table 60. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Organizational Management Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Survey, and Self-Reported Job Satisfaction for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: 4-H Policies and Procedures	146	---				
2. J.S. Level: 4-H Policies and Procedures	146	.070	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.133	.146	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.156	.043	-.081	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.146	.255**	.110	-.074	---
1. Rank: Work with Media	146	---				
2. J.S. Level: Work with Media	146	.292**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.061	.227**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.000	.004	-.081	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.005	.104	.110	-.074	---
1. Rank: Collect Data	146	---				
2. J.S. Level: Collect Data	146	.110	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.071	.053	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.036	-.132	-.081	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.074	.127	.110	-.074	---
1. Rank: Risk Management	146	---				
2. J.S. Level: Risk Management	146	.249**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.075	.185*	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.061	-.162	-.081	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.094	.329**	.110	-.074	---
1. Rank: Financial Management	146	---				
2. J.S. Level: Financial Management	146	.171*	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.157	.130	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	-.154	-.049	-.081	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	-.051	.319**	.110	-.074	---
1. Rank: Conduct Research	146	---				
2. J.S. Level: Conduct Research	146	.400**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	.127	.272**	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.032	.022	-.081	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.000	.138	.110	-.074	---
1. Rank: Professional Association	146	---				
2. J.S. Level: Professional Association	146	.357**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Job Satisfaction	205	-.187*	.060	---		
4. Job Satisfaction Survey	145	.053	.024	-.081	---	
5. Self-Reported Job Satisfaction	145	.085	.196*	.110	-.074	

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation of J.S. stands for Job Satisfaction; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility in Youth Development Domain, 2 = Job Satisfaction of Individual Job Responsibility in the youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Job Satisfaction, 4 = Overall Job Satisfaction Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Job Satisfaction.

The definitions used to describe the level of relationship between variables for all of the correlation results were as follows:

- A strong relationship: r is between .500 and 1.00 or between -.500 and -1.00;
- A moderate relationship: r is between .300 and .500 or between -.300 and -.500;
- A weak relationship: r is between .100 and .300 or between -.100 and -.300;
- Little to no relationship: r is between .000 and .100 or between .000 and -.100.

Results common among all 4-H PRKC domains. There was a strong, negative relationship (r = -.710, n = 145, p < .05) between the burnout survey and overall self-reported burnout variables. This relationship was reported in all six 4-H PRKC domain correlation results.

Youth development domain. Table 61 shows the results of the correlation between the workload and burnout variables for the youth development domain. The variables for burnout of job responsibility #3 "providing opportunities in project areas" and the self-reported overall domain burnout had a strong, positive relationship (r = .516, n = 205, p < .05). There were two additional pairs of variables that demonstrated a strong relationship and seven pairs that showed a moderate relationship for the youth development domain. The additional correlation results with a strong relationship were (a) burnout for job responsibility #2 "create programs" and the self-reported degree of burnout variables for the youth development domain (r = .513, n = 205, p < .05), and (b) burnout for job responsibility #6 "life skills" and the self-reported degree of burnout variables for the youth development domain (r = .502, n = 205, p < .05).

The first moderate relationship reported within the youth development domain was positive between the self-reported degree of burnout for the youth development domain and

the overall degree of burnout variables (r = .402, n = 145, p < .05). A positive relationship was reported between the burnout for job responsibility #2 "create programs" and the overall degree of burnout (r = .353, n = 145, p < .05). A positive relationship was reported between the burnout for job responsibility #4 "positive relationships" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the youth development domain (r = .345, n = 205, p < .05). There was a positive relationship between the burnout for job responsibility #3 and the overall degree of burnout (r = .429, n = 145, p < .05). Job responsibility #6 "life skills" had two relationships for different variables. The first significant, moderate relationship was a negative relationship between the burnout for the job responsibility and the overall burnout survey score (r = -.330, n = 145, p < .05). There was also a positive, moderate relationship between burnout for job responsibility #6 and the overall degree of burnout (r = .476, n = 145, p < .05). The final relationship in the youth development domain was between the burnout for job responsibility #7 "dealing with conflict management" and the overall degree of burnout (r = .311, n = 145, p < .05).

Youth program development domain. The correlation results for the youth program development domain are reported in Table 62. Among the youth program development domain variables that measured burnout, the self-reported domain burnout and overall self-reported burnout variables had a positive, moderate relationship (r = .470, n = 145, p < .05). For the domain, there were six additional items that indicated a moderate relationship between variables. The first of those was between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #6 "evaluate programs and communicate the results" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the youth program development domain (r = .318, n = 205, p < .05).

Table 61. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Youth Development Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Burnout, Burnout Survey, and Self-Reported Burnout for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Professional Develop	201	---				
2. B.O. Level: Professional Develop.	200	.001	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.050	.173*	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.004	-.196*	-.223**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.080	.294**	.402**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Create Programs	201	---				
2. B.O. Level: Create Programs	200	.130	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.116	.513**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.145	-.234**	-.223**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.189*	.353**	.402**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Project Area Opportunities	201	---				
2. B.O. Level: Project Area Opportunities	200	-.261**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.049	.516**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.035	-.271**	-.223**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.026	.429**	.402**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Positive Relationships	201	---				
2. B.O. Level: Positive Relationships	200	-.047	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.031	.345**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.042	-.199*	-.223**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.050	.251**	.402**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Positive Behaviors	201	---				
2. B.O. Level: Positive Behaviors	200	-.053	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.003	.212**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.026	-.284**	-.223**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.051	-.281**	.402**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Life Skills	201	---				
2. B.O. Level: Life Skills	200	-.072	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.009	.502**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.047	-.330**	-.223**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.057	.476**	.402**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Conflict Management	201	---				
2. B.O. Level: Conflict Management	200	-.250**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.014	.112	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.094	-.299**	-.223**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.025	.311**	.402**	-.710**	---

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation B.O. stands for burnout; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 2 = Burnout Level of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Burnout, 4 = Overall Burnout Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Burnout.

There was a negative, moderate relationships between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #6 and the overall score of the burnout survey (r = -.367, n = 145, $p < .05$). The self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #6 had a positive

relationship with the overall self-reported degree of burnout reported by 4-H youth development professionals (r = .382, n = 145, p < .05). Job responsibility #7 "working with design teams to plan programs" had three variables which had a moderate relationship. There was a positive relationship between the job responsibility burnout variable and the self-reported degree of burnout for the youth program development domain (r = .310, n = 205, p < .05). There was a negative relationship between the job responsibility #7 self-reported degree of burnout and the overall score of the burnout survey (r = -.346, n = 145, p < .05). The final two variables with a positive relationship for the youth program development domain were between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #7 and the overall degree of burnout reported by 4-H youth development professionals.

Volunteerism domain. The volunteerism domain correlation results are reported in Table 63. A positive, moderate relationship was reported between the self-reported domain burnout and the overall self-reported burnout (r = .400, n = 145, p < .05). The volunteerism domain had six additional items which were correlated with a moderate relationship between variables.

The first pair of variables that had a positive relationship was the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #1 "use volunteer committees" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the volunteerism domain (r = .355, n = 205, p < .05). A negative relationship was found between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #1 and the overall burnout survey results (r = -.300, n = 145, p < .05). There was one more positive relationship found between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #1, and it was with the overall degree of burnout as reported by 4-H youth development professionals (r = .345, n = 145, p < .05).

Table 62. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Youth Program Development Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Burnout, Burnout Survey, and Self-Reported Burnout for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Use Research	175	---				
2. B.O. Level: Use Research	175	-.085	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.048	.230**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.004	-.165*	-.280**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.055	.200*	.470**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Advocate with Advisory Boards	175	---				
2. B.O. Level: Advocate with Advisory Boards	175	-.120	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.022	.294**	----		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.009	-.266**	-.280**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.029	.276**	.470**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Community Partners	175	---				
2. B.O. Level: Community Partners	175	.046	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.041	.192*	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.046	-.240**	-.280**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.071	.229**	.470**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Planning Programs	175	---				
2. B.O. Level: Planning Programs	175	.109	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.024	.199**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.046	-.148	-.280**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.014	.278**	.470**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: 4-H Curriculum	175	---				
2. B.O. Level: 4-H Curriculum	175	-.058	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.039	.257**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.054	-.080	-.280**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.035	.208*	.470**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Evaluate Programs	175	---				
2. B.O. Level: Evaluate Programs	175	.117	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.009	.318**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.052	-.367**	-.280**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.030	.382**	.470**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Design Teams	175	---				
2. B.O. Level: Design Teams	175	.001	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.019	.310**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.053	-.346**	-.280**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.006	.301**	.470**	-.710**	---

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation B.O. stands for burnout; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 2 = Burnout Level of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Burnout, 4 = Overall Burnout Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Burnout.

Also reported in Table 63, a positive relationship was demonstrated between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #5 "recognizing volunteers" and the overall degree of burnout as reported by 4-H youth development professionals (r = .314, n = 145, p < .05). A positive relationship was reported between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #7 "recruit volunteers" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the volunteerism domain (r = .300, n = 205, p < .05). The final positive relationship for the volunteerism domain was shown to be between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #7 and the overall degree of burnout as reported by 4-H youth development professionals (r = .306, n = 145, p < .05).

Equity, access, and opportunity domain. Table 64 indicates the results of the correlation for the equity, access, and opportunity domain. Among the variables measuring burnout in the domain, the self-reported domain burnout and the degree of burnout for job responsibility #6 "provide training around equity, access, and opportunity" showed a positive and strong relationship (r = .504, n = 205, p < .05).

The equity, access, and opportunity domain had 12 additional correlations with a moderate relationship between variables. Those relationships are: (a) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #1 "building community relationships" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the equity, access, and opportunity domain (r = .426, n = 205, p < .05), (b) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #1 "building community relationships" and the overall degree of burnout as reported by 4-H youth development professionals (r = .321, n = 145, p < .05), (c) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for the equity, access, and opportunity domain and the overall degree of burnout as

reported by 4-H youth development professionals ($r = .331$, $n = 145$, $p < .05$). (d) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #2 "marketing programs to diverse audiences" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the equity, access, and opportunity domain ($r = .323$, $n = 205$, $p < .05$). (e) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #3 "recruit diverse volunteers" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the equity, access, and opportunity domain ($r = .368$, $n = 205$, $p < .05$). (f) negative relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #3 and the overall burnout score from the burnout survey ($r = -.305$, $n = 145$, $p < .05$). (g) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #3 and the overall degree of burnout as reported by 4-H youth development professionals ($r = .304$, $n = 145$, $p < .05$). (h) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #4 "diversity on advisory boards" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the equity, access, and opportunity domain ($r = .429$, $n = 205$, $p < .05$). (i) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #5 "diversity in programs" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the equity, access, and opportunity domain ($r = .372$, $n = 205$, $p < .05$). (j) negative relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #5 and the overall burnout score from the burnout survey ($r = -.322$, $n = 145$, $p < .05$). (k) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #5 and the overall degree of burnout as reported by 4-H youth development professionals ($r = .313$, $n = 145$, $p < .05$). and (l) positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #7 "develop materials for diverse

audiences" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the equity, access, and opportunity domain ($r = .445$, $n = 205$, $p < .05$).

Table 63. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Volunteerism Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Burnout, Burnout Survey, and Self-Reported Burnout for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Use Volunteer Committees	162	---				
2. B.O. Level: Use Volunteer Committees	162	-.023	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.085	.355**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.023	-.300**	-.290**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.066	.345**	.400**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Volunteer Selection Process	162	---				
2. B.O. Level: Volunteer Selection Process	162	-.078	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.087	.161*	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.062	-.131	-.290**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.037	.131	.400**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Educational Opportunities	162	---				
2. B.O. Level: Educational Opportunities	162	.153	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.088	.270**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.110	-.168*	-.290**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.099	.226**	.400**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Provide Feedback	162	---				
2. B.O. Level: Provide Feedback	162	-.085	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.079	.139	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.010	-.169*	-.290**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.018	.121	.400**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Recognize Volunteers	162	---				
2. B.O. Level: Recognize Volunteers	162	-.041	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.100	.218**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.046	-.294**	-.290**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.179*	.314**	.400**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Written Position Descriptions	162	---				
2. B.O. Level: Written Position Descriptions	162	.077	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.023	.158*	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.058	-.241**	-.290**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.040	.267**	.400**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Recruit Volunteers	162	---				
2. B.O. Level: Recruit Volunteers	162	-.044	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.061	.300*	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.070	-.297**	-.290**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.063	.306**	.400**	-.710**	---

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation B.O. stands for burnout; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 2 Burnout Level of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Burnout, 4 = Overall Burnout Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Burnout.

Table 64. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Equity, Access, and Opportunity Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Burnout, Burnout Survey, and Self-Reported Burnout for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Build Community Relationships	158	---				
2. B.O. Level: Build Community Relationships	158	.136	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.015	.426**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.039	-.261**	-.213*	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.076	.321**	.331**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Marketing Programs	158	---				
2. B.O. Level: Marketing Programs	158	-.070	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.065	.323**	----		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.061	-.225**	-.213*	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.031	.240**	.331**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Recruit Diverse Volunteers	158	---				
2. B.O. Level: Recruit Diverse Volunteers	158	.059	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.052	.368**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.014	-.305**	-.213*	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.028	.304**	.331**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Diversity on Advisory Boards	158	---				
2. B.O. Level: Diversity on Advisory Boards	158	.017	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.131	.429**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.121	-.200*	-.213*	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.083	.250**	.331**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Diversity in Programs	158	---				
2. B.O. Level: Diversity in Programs	158	.038	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.094	.372**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.061	-.322**	-.213*	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.060	.313**	.331**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Training	158	---				
2. B.O. Level: Training	158	-.054	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.125	.504**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.009	-.100	-.213*	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.001	.238**	.331**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Develop Materials	158	---				
2. B.O. Level: Develop Materials	158	-.059	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.165*	.445**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.010	-.104	-.213*	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.003	-.246**	.331**	-.710**	---

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation B.O. stands for burnout; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 2 = Burnout Level of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Burnout, 4 = Overall Burnout Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Burnout.

Partnership domain. Table 65 is the results for the correlations within the partnership domain. The partnership-domain variables measuring burnout had a positive, moderate relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout of job responsibility #4 "involved in community coalitions" and the domain's degree of burnout (r = .426, n = 205, p < .05). The partnership domain had eight moderate relationships between variables. The first positive relationship was revealed between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #1 "facilitate on 4-H boards and committees" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the partnership domain (r = .351, n = 205, p < .05). A negative relationship was found between the self-reported degree of burnout for the partnership domain and the overall degree of burnout as reported by 4-H youth development professionals (r = -.328, n = 145, p < .05). There was a positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #2 "advocate for youth" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the partnership domain (r = .366, n = 205, p < .05).

There was a positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #3 (provide opportunities for youth to lead) and the self-reported degree of burnout for the partnership domain (r = .379, n = 205, p < .05). Another positive relationship was found between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #3 and the overall degree of burnout as reported by the 4-H youth development professionals (r = .338, n = 145, p < .05). There was a positive relationship between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #5 "workforce skills" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the partnership domain (r = .326, n = 205, p < .05). The final positive relationship was found between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #7 "work with current boards and committees to increase youth

involvement" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the partnership domain (r = .330, n = 205, p < .05).

Table 65. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Partnership Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Burnout, Burnout Survey, and Self-Reported Burnout for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: Facilitate on 4-H Boards	153	---				
2. B.O. Level: Facilitate on 4-H Boards	153	.239**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.274**	.351*	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.039	-.199*	-.267**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.131	.234**	-.328**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Advocate for Youth	153	---				
2. B.O. Level: Advocate for Youth	153	.102	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.163*	.366**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.083	-.208*	-.267**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.057	.250**	-.328**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Youth Lead	153	---				
2. B.O. Level: Youth Lead	153	-.192*	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.064	.379**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.070	-.294**	-.267**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.004	.338**	-.328**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Community Coalitions	153	---				
2. B.O. Level: Community Coalitions	153	-.004	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.033	.426**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.007	-.164	-.267**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.051	.216*	-.328**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Work-Force Skills	153	---				
2. B.O. Level: Work-Force Skills	153	-.043	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.138	.326**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.051	-.269**	-.267**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.073	.253**	-.328**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: -Youth in Community Change	153	---				
2. B.O. Level: Youth in Community Change	153	.032	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.050	.279**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.044	-.185*	-.267**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.066	.173*	-.328**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Work with Current Boards	153	---				
2. B.O. Level: Work with Current Boards	153	.035	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.056	.330**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.098	-.141	-.267**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.127	.196*	-.328**	-.710**	---

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation B.O. stands for burnout; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 2 = Burnout Level of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Burnout, 4 = Overall Burnout Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Burnout.

Organizational management domain. The correlation results for the organizational management domain are reported in Table 66. Among the organizational management domain variables, a positive and moderate relationship (r = .438, n = 145, p < .05) occurred between the self-reported domain burnout and overall self-reported burnout. There were five additional moderate relationships between variables within the organizational management domain. A positive relationship was shown between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #1 "develop and/or support both state and local policies and procedures" and the self-reported degree of burnout for the organizational management domain (r = .339, n = 205, p < .05). Another positive relationship was found between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #1 and the overall degree of burnout as reported by the 4-H youth development professionals (r = .355, n = 145, p < .05).

The following results are also reported in Table 66. There was a negative relationship reported between the self-reported degree of burnout for the overall burnout score from the burnout survey and the overall degree of burnout as reported by the 4-H youth development professionals (r = -.346, n = 145, p < .05). A negative relationship (r = -.326, n = 146, p < .05) was demonstrated between the rank score and the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #3 "collect enrollment data." The final moderate relationship found in the organizational management domain was between the self-reported degree of burnout for job responsibility #5 "conduct research and report those results" and the overall degree of burnout as reported by the 4-H youth development professionals (r = .305, n = 145, p < .05).

Table 66. Pearson Product Correlation Results for Organizational Management Domain Job Responsibility Rank, Self-Reported Domain Burnout, Burnout Survey, and Self-Reported Burnout for Participating 4-H Youth Development Professionals

	N	1	2	3	4	5
1. Rank: 4-H Policies and Procedures	146	---				
2. B.O. Level: 4-H Policies and Procedures	146	.193*	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.228**	.339**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.055	-.268**	-.346**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.084	.355**	.438**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Work with Media	146	---				
2. B.O. Level: Work with Media	146	-.057	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.072	.196*	----		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.007	.287**	-.346**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.034	.243**	.438**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Collect Data	146	---				
2. B.O. Level: Collect Data	146	-.326**	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	-.045	.124	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.026	-.210*	-.346**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.033	.239**	.438**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Risk Management	146	---				
2. B.O. Level: Risk Management	146	-.073	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.129	.120	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.211*	-.292**	-.346**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.184*	.210*	.438**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Financial Management	146	---				
2. B.O. Level: Financial Management	146	-.171	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.143	.225**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	-.042	-.269*	-.346**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	.043	.192*	.438**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Conduct Research	146	---				
2. B.O. Level: Conduct Research	146	-.096	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.126	.238**	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.063	-.298**	-.346**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.010	.305**	.438**	-.710**	---
1. Rank: Professional Association	146	---				
2. B.O. Level: Professional Association	146	-.040	---			
3. Self-Reported Domain Burnout	205	.055	.191*	---		
4. Burnout Survey	145	.100	-.134	-.346**	---	
5. Self-Reported Burnout	145	-.012	.237**	.438**	-.710**	---

Note. *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). The abbreviation B.O. stands for burnout; 1 = Rank of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 2 = Burnout Level of Individual Job Responsibility for Youth Development Domain, 3 = Self-Reported Overall Youth Development Domain Level of Burnout, 4 = Overall Burnout Survey Score, and 5 = Self-Reported Level of Overall Burnout.

Summary

The 4-H youth development professionals from six land-grant universities were asked to rank a set of job responsibilities that were related to the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competency (4-H PRKC) model which was designed to provide a framework for quality youth development. The respondents were asked to determine on which of the six domains they spent the greatest percentage of work time and where they thought the greatest percentage of work time should be spent. The 4-H youth development professionals reported spending 27.2% of their time working within the youth program development domain, which was also the domain where they thought the greatest percentage of time should be spent.

When determining the ranking of the job responsibilities, each domain had seven job responsibilities that were common to the youth development profession. The 4-H youth development professionals were asked to rank order these seven tasks from the one they did the most often (score of 1) to the one they did the least (score of 7). The job responsibility that had the lowest mean (M = 2.26, SD = 1.81) of any job responsibility from the six domains was #1 "using volunteer committees" in the volunteerism domain: 71.9% of the respondents ranked the job responsibility as one of the top two. Participating in professional development opportunities related to growth and development (job responsibility #1 within the youth development domain) had the greatest mean for the six domains (M = 5.40, SD = 1.77): 57.3% of the respondents ranked this job responsibility as either a 6 or 7.

The second research question addressed the correlation between workload and job satisfaction. Determining job satisfaction related to the individual job responsibilities was

the first mode used in identifying the level of job satisfaction in the survey. The 4-H youth development professionals were asked to self-report their level of job satisfaction based on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5, *1 with being extremely satisfied* and *5 being extremely dissatisfied.* For this construct, all job responsibilities (6 domains X 7 job responsibilities each = 42 total job responsibilities) had a mean between 1.00 and 2.99 for the study participants.

The youth development domain's job responsibility #5 "develop programs to practice life skills" provided the respondents with the greatest degree of job satisfaction for any of the responsibilities within the six 4-H PRKC domains. The mean for responsibility #5 was 1.93 (*SD* = 0.72); 85.8% of the respondents reported either an extremely satisfied or satisfied level of job satisfaction.

The second method of determining the level of job satisfaction was the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). This survey included a series of 36 questions which were combined into 9 facets (pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-worker, nature of work, and communication). The scale for this instrument was an agreement scale of 1 to 7 (*1 = disagree very much* and *7 = agree very much*). The overall mean for the JSS was 3.72 (*SD* = 0.79). The lowest level of job satisfaction of the nine facets was the pay facet (*M* = 2.71, *SD* = 0.68). The greatest job satisfaction (*M* = 4.93, *SD* = 0.18) was within the nature of the work itself.

The third and final tactic to determine job satisfaction was the self-reported overall level of job satisfaction. All respondents were asked to report their overall level of satisfaction, based on a 5 point Likert-type scale (*1 = extremely satisfied* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied*). The mean for the self-reported overall job satisfaction was 2.20 (*SD* = 0.83);

79.2% of the group reported being either extremely satisfied or satisfied with their current job.

There was a Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient conducted between the workload and job-satisfaction variables (Variables were a rank order of job responsibility, job satisfaction for job responsibilities, level of job satisfaction for the domain, overall JSS score, and overall job satisfaction.) to determine if there was a relationship between any two variables. Job responsibility #2 "creating positive relationships" had the strongest positive relationship ($r = .505$, $p < .05$) between workload and job satisfaction. This relationship was between the degree of reported job satisfaction for the job responsibility and the rank score for the job responsibility.

The third research question asked if there were a correlation between workload and burnout. Like the job satisfaction construct, there were three methods used to measure the degree of burnout: the self-reported degree of burnout for each job responsibility, the overall burnout survey score, and the self-reported overall degree of burnout. Each method was used in the correlation results.

The degree of burnout related to each job responsibility was measured using a Likert-type scale of *1 = a very small degree* to *5 = a very large degree*. The greatest degree of reported burnout (M = 3.21, SD = 1.26) related to the domain job responsibilities was the youth development domain's job responsibility #7 "dealing with conflict management": 44.9% of the survey respondents reported a large or very large degree of burnout related to this job responsibility. Being involved in professional associations (organizational management domain's job responsibility #7) had the lowest reported degree of burnout (*M*

= 1.65, *SD* = 0.92), with 80.2% of the group reporting a very small to small degree of burnout.

The second method to determine burnout was the burnout survey portion of the instrument. The burnout survey included 40 statements in which the respondents reported level of agreement, based on a 6-point scale (*1 = agree very much* and *6 = disagree very much*). The overall mean for the burnout survey was 3.84 (*SD* = 0.86).

The third and final phase for determining burnout was the self-reported degree of overall burnout, which was measured using a 5-point, Likert-type scale (*1 = a very small degree* and *5 = a very a large degree*). For the 4-H youth development professionals who responded to the survey, 41.1% reported a small to very small degree of burnout, and 24.8% reported a large or very large degree of burnout. The mean for the overall self-reported burnout was 2.75 (*SD* = 1.17).

To determine if a relationship existed between workload and burnout, a Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient test was conducted on the workload variables and burnout variables. The variables were a rank order of job responsibility, degree of burnout for individual job responsibilities, degree of burnout for domain, overall burnout survey score, and overall degree of burnout. The strongest relationship for workload and burnout was the rank score for youth development domain job responsibility #3 "provide opportunities to explore skill in project areas" and the self-reported level of job satisfaction for the youth development domain ($r = .516$, $p < .05$). There was a strong, negative relationship reported between the overall burnout survey score and the overall reported degree of burnout ($r = -.710$, $p < .05$).

As a group, 4-H youth development professionals spent more time working within the youth development, youth program development, and volunteerism domains. Within these three domains, there were more job responsibilities that allowed the 4-H youth development professionals to work with others. They also reported that they were satisfied with their job, both with an overall level of job satisfaction and with the individual job responsibilities. The 4-H youth development professionals also reported very little burnout for their job and the individual elements of the job.

CHAPTER FIVE. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine how Extension 4-H youth development professionals rank a set of common, predetermined job responsibilities, based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC), as well as the correlation of workload to job satisfaction and burnout. The study utilized quantitative methods for gathering data from Extension professionals who worked within the 4-H youth development program at the University of Idaho, Montana State University, the University of Wyoming, Colorado State University, Washington State University, and Oregon State University.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. Based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (also known as the 4-H PRKC) domains, how do 4-H youth development professionals rank the associated job responsibilities?
2. Is there a correlation between workload and job satisfaction of 4-H youth development professionals, and what is the correlation?
3. What is the correlation between workload and burnout in Extension 4-H youth development professionals?

Summary of Results

Historically, 4-H youth development professionals had a large workload with a variety of job responsibilities. When the 4-H Professional, Research, and Knowledge (4-H PRK) framework was created in 1985, it changed the way Extension professionals who had

4-H youth development responsibilities were viewed by their colleagues. The 4-H youth development profession was not seen as an unheralded transition to a position as an Extension educator. The 4-H PRK created a framework for knowledge areas to help the professionals design, implement, and evaluate the informal, experiential educational experiences for youth. When the 4-H PRK was updated in 2004 and was transformed into the 4-H PRKC, it became the context from which 4-H youth development position descriptions were created, professional development topics arose, and a way to attract and retain quality 4-H youth development professionals (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004).

Workload Summary

The competencies developed with the 4-H PRKC are a sound foundation in determining what job-related tasks 4-H youth development professionals should be doing. This study provides an addition to the research for professionals using the 4-H PRKC framework and the 4-H youth development profession by discovering the competencies in which 4-H youth development professionals are actually engaging. This study also provides an understanding about how those competencies affect the job satisfaction and burnout of 4-H youth development professionals. This understanding may enhance the 4-H youth development profession because the job descriptions or workloads can be adjusted to better reflect what a particular 4-H youth development professional is actually doing.

To determine the workload as it related to the 4-H PRKC, the research participants were first asked to identify the percentage of work time they spent in each of the six domains. Next, the 4-H youth development professionals were asked to identify how much work time should be spent in each domain. Finally, the participants had to rank order seven job responsibilities for each of the six 4-H PRKC domains based on where they spent the

most time and where they spent the least amount of time. Those results were then compiled, and an overall mean score was determined for each job responsibility. The 4-H youth development professionals reported spending the greatest amount of time in the youth program development domain (27.2%), followed by the youth development domain (21.6%) and the volunteerism domain (20.7%), for a total of 69.5% of their work time in these three domains.

Job Satisfaction Summary

Job satisfaction is a topic that has been studied frequently in the field of Extension. However, information was lacking in the literature related to the 4-H PRKC competencies (or job responsibilities) that are common among 4-H youth development professionals and the professionals' level of job satisfaction. This study set out to determine how 4-H youth development professionals classified their job satisfaction related to the 4-H PRKC job responsibilities. Study participants self-reported their level of job satisfaction, from extremely satisfied to extremely dissatisfied, for each of the 4-H PRKC domains, the seven individual job responsibilities for each of the six domains, and their overall level of job satisfaction.

To further measure job satisfaction without the self-reporting element, 4-H youth development professionals completed the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). This instrument was comprised of 36 questions that used an agreement scale to determine job satisfaction. For the JSS, results were calculated for the overall level of satisfaction as well as for nine different facets. Those nine facets were pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-worker, nature of the work, and communication.

Burnout Summary

The final assessment in this study was to measure the degree of burnout for 4-H youth development professionals. A scale from *1 = very small degree of burnout* to *5 very large degree* of burnout was used when 4-H youth development professionals were self-reporting their degree of burnout related to each of the six 4-H PRKC domains, the seven individual job responsibilities within each domain, and the overall level of job burnout. To capture the degree of burnout for 4-H youth development professionals that was not self-reported or directly related to a specific job responsibility, the study participants completed a burnout survey that was designed and pilot tested by the researcher. The 40 questions included in the burnout survey were adapted from previous research (Borritz & Kristensen, 2004; Livestrong, 2010; Mind Tools, 2010; New Unionism Network, 2004). For consistency with the Job Satisfaction Survey, the instrument to measure burnout used an agreement scale. The overall degree of burnout was computed.

Data Analysis Summary

Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, and frequencies) were used to report the ranking of the job responsibilities within each domain, the self-reported job satisfaction and burnout for the job responsibilities, the nine facets of the JSS, the overall level of job satisfaction (based on the JSS), the overall degree of burnout (based on the burnout survey questions), and the self-reported level of overall job satisfaction and degree of burnout for the job. The Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient was used to assess the relationship between job satisfaction and workload as well as between burnout and workload.

Demographic Summary

There were 502 Extension professionals invited to participate in the study; 241 people completed the entire survey, yielding a return rate of 48.0%. Of the 241 respondents who completed the survey (Appendix D), 77.6% were female, and 22.4% were male. There were 32.0% of the respondents who reported that they were 50-59 years old; this age range had the largest percentage overall. The next-largest age group was 30-39 years old (22.8%). A total of 75.5% of the 4-H youth development professionals reported that they were between 30 and 59 years old. There were 16.2% of the 4-H youth development professionals who reported being 18-29 years old. The smallest group of 4-H youth development professionals was those who identified themselves as being over 60 years old, which was 8.3% of the total group.

The 4-H youth development professionals who participated in the study could be categorized into two types of positions. The categories were (a) county-based professionals (county program assistant, county program coordinator, county Extension educator, area Extension educator, and county director/chair) and (b) state-based professionals (state Extension associates, state specialist, and state program leader). There were 448 county-based professionals who were initially invited to participate in the study. A total of 222 completed the survey, yielding a return rate of 49.6%. County-based professionals were 85.1% of the 4-H youth development professionals who participated. From the county-based professionals, county Extension educators had the greatest proportion of responses with 51.9% of the participants.

For state-level professionals, a potential of 54 individuals were invited to participate in the study. Of them, 29 individuals participated, and the response rate was 52.7%. The

response rate from the individual primary job titles for state-level professionals was relatively small due to the limited number of individuals who participated in the study. The state Extension associate and state specialist groups each had 4.1% of the total responses within the state-level professionals' category.

The University of Idaho 4-H youth development professionals had the greatest response rate (23.2% of the total responses). Response rates varied among LGU groups with the University of Idaho being the greatest (76.7%) and Washington State University having the lowest response rate (27.3%). There were several factors that may have affected the response rates for the land-grant universities involved. For example, a possible reason UI had the greatest response rate could be the pre-existing professional relationship the researcher had with the 4-H youth development professionals. The researcher is currently employed at UI, and because the potential study participants knew the researcher personally, they may have been more motivated to complete the instrument. The Extension director or state 4-H program leader at MSU, CSU, and OSU sent a personal note to 4-H youth development professionals and encouraged participation in the study, which may have been a reason these LGUs had a greater return rate than WSU or UW.

Of the 241 participants who completed the study, 60.1% had worked in 4-H youth development for 10 or fewer years, and 42.3% of the total group were in their first 6 years of employment. When asked how long 4-H youth development professionals had been in their current position, 70.8% said they were in their first 10 years, and 61.3% were in the first 6 years of their career.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine how Extension 4-H youth development professionals rank a set of common, predetermined job responsibilities, based on the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC), and to correlate workload to job satisfaction and burnout. This portion of Chapter Five will draw conclusions regarding the workload of 4-H youth development professionals as well as the relationship of workload to job satisfaction and burnout.

Demographic Conclusions

Since 1990, there has been a decrease in both county- and state-level 4-H youth development professionals (Astroth, 2007). The overall number of county-based professionals has decreased 48% since 1990, but the number of paraprofessionals (county program assistants and county program coordinators) has actually increased 56% during this same time period. These groups of 4-H youth development professionals are now doing the job that Extension educators did in the past. For this study, 24.9% of the respondents identified themselves as either a county program assistant or a county program coordinator; in addition, 45% of these professionals were in their first six years of employment in the 4-H youth development profession.

Astroth (2007) pointed out that work previously done by county Extension educators (who typically have either a bachelor's or master's degree) is now being done by county program assistants or county program coordinators (who usually need a high school diploma, an associate's degree, or a bachelor's degree). The current study found that 9.2% of the respondents had either a high school diploma or an associate's degree while 32% had

a bachelor's degree. The remaining 58.9% of the respondents reported having a master's degree or a doctorate.

The 4-H youth development professionals have a diverse range of educational levels and may have varying entry-level skill sets. It is critical to know what job responsibilities the 4-H youth development professionals are expected to spend their time doing and what they actually do in order to better understand what skill sets are needed by these professionals. As an example, if 4-H youth development professionals are spending a large portion of their work time conducting evaluations and they do not have enough knowledge to conduct an evaluation, it may affect their job satisfaction and burnout. Additional training may be needed to improve the skills of the 4-H youth development professionals for those job responsibilities where they are spending the majority of their time. Additional training should make the task easier for the 4-H youth development professional to understand and, thus, may increase the level of job satisfaction for that particular job responsibility.

The results of this research support the idea that many people in the 4-H youth development workforce are at the beginning of their career. Of the 4-H youth development professionals who completed the study, 60.1% were in the first 10 years of their career, and 45% of the county program assistants and county program coordinators were in the first six years of their career. It is crucial to evaluate where 4-H youth development professionals are spending their work time and to discover job responsibilities are most important for a 4-H professional. This evaluation will give the 4-H youth development professionals a better understanding of what is expected of them from the beginning of their career; this

knowledge could help the level of job satisfaction increase and the degree of burnout decrease as they move forward.

Research is also needed to determine what degrees are required for entry-level 4-H youth development professionals. The issue of what entry-level skills 4-H youth development professionals bring to the position is intriguing and should be explored in further research. First, it is important to determine what skills 4-H youth development professionals should possess. Second, the skill sets that 4-H youth development professionals currently possess should be categorized based on job title and level of education. Understanding these factors will lead to a better quality of 4-H youth development professionals and improved training opportunities.

Of the study population, 54.6% of the respondents reported having a 100% 4-H youth development appointment. However, 4.6% of the 4-H youth development professionals reported less than a 15% 4-H youth development appointment. The study included one county program coordinator who reported a 5% appointment to 4-H youth development, five county Extension educators with less than 15% appointment to 4-H youth development, three county chairs with less than 15% 4-H youth development responsibility, and two 4-H youth development professionals with other job titles who reported less than 15% 4-H youth development appointment. Even with the small sample size, the ANOVA Tukey results indicated that the results of this study were not influenced by those with a 4-H youth development appointment of less than 15% for youth development responsibilities.

Research Question 1: Workload Conclusions

A Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (2007) report recommended that regular workload studies should be conducted to determine how much time is being spent on individual job responsibilities. Workload studies give researchers an understanding of *what is* compared to *what should be* as the results relate to job-specific responsibilities. The method to determine workload for 4-H youth development professionals was to measure the percentage of time they spent on individual job responsibilities. For this study, the job responsibilities were based on the 4-H PRKC framework.

With the changing staff trends and the increased importance of the 4-H PRKC framework, the need to understand what job responsibilities are most prevalent in a 4-H youth development professional's work time is becoming more crucial. To hire, mentor, and retain the 4-H youth development professional who best fits the job, it is critical that position descriptions accurately reflect the work to be done. If it is an expectation that all 4-H youth development professionals report the impact of their programs, then evaluation should be a part of all 4-H youth development position descriptions.

This study found that 4-H youth development professionals spend less time on their evaluation job responsibilities than other job responsibilities. This job responsibility had the lowest reported level of job satisfaction and the highest degree of burnout for the youth program development domain. The 4-H youth development professionals need to understand, from the beginning, that they are expected to do evaluations. This knowledge may help with hiring, mentoring, and retaining new 4-H youth development professionals.

General 4-H PRKC Job Responsibility Ranking Conclusions

The literature review investigating the workload of 4-H youth development professionals yielded meaningful results. There were two studies which demonstrated that a relationship between a 4-H youth development professional's workload and turnover does exist (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2003; Astroth & Lindstrom, 2008). Astroth and Lindstrom (2008) said that the long and irregular hours worked by 4-H youth development professionals contributed to turnover. Similar results were discussed in the Annie E. Casey Foundation (2003) report, which cited long hours and extreme workloads as factors that can lead to burnout and turnover for 4-H youth development professionals. The present study provides several noteworthy contributions to better understand the types of job responsibilities where 4-H youth development professionals spend their time. Insight into this knowledge may help current 4-H youth development professionals understand where they spend the most time. It may also assist them in making changes to the way they approach or complete those tasks. Understanding what job responsibilities the 4-H professional enjoyed would allow them to spend more time focusing on those job responsibilities they enjoy and where they can gain a higher level of job satisfaction.

The 4-H youth development professionals from the six western land-grant university Extension systems who participated in this study gave a greater rank score to tasks that allowed them to work directly with people and a lower rank score on tasks related to infrastructure or office-type job responsibilities. Each 4-H PRKC domain had seven job responsibilities, and the 4-H youth development professionals ranked them from the one on which they spent the most time to the one where they spent the least amount of time. Even though each domain was independent of the others, there were some job

responsibilities with a higher response frequency when ranking as the top one or two or as the bottom choice (a rank of a seven).

The job responsibility that was ranked on top within the volunteerism domain (using volunteer committees) also had the greatest percentage of being ranked as the top response for any of the 4-H PRKC domains. This job-related task had 52.5% of the respondents ranking it as the one they performed most. It is important that 4-H youth development professionals have the skills or knowledge to facilitate groups. Working with groups or committees requires good facilitation skills. Organizations should hire individuals who already have those skills or offer additional professional development in order to assure their 4-H professionals have the skills needed.

The 4-H youth development professionals reported spending 20.7% of their work time completing job-related tasks in the volunteerism domain. Understanding and utilizing a volunteer middle-management program for the local 4-H program would alleviate some of the workload usually done by the 4-H youth development professional. An example of a job responsibility that could be turned over to a volunteer middle manager would be recruiting volunteers. This job responsibility was ranked 7th (out of 7) for the amount of time 4-H youth development professionals spent on it. A 4-H youth development program may not be feasible if there is a lack of volunteers to lead the youth. Understanding how to work with volunteers is a knowledge-base needed by 4-H professionals, and these skills could be increased for the current professionals through added professional development opportunities.

In the equity, access, and opportunity domain, 40.4% of the 4-H youth development professionals reported spending the least amount of time on designing materials for diverse

audiences. Depending on where the 4-H youth development professional lives and works, there may not be a great demand to design materials for diverse audiences. This domain may also require additional diversity training that goes beyond ethnic diversity. When professionals understand all definitions of diversity, it may lead them to spend more time in the equity, access, and opportunity domain. For those 4-H youth development professionals who live in geographic areas that do have diverse audiences, providing the resources needed to reach those audiences, including 4-H publications in the audience's native language or specialized training on issues around diversity, would be appropriate.

4-H PRKC Domain Individual Job Responsibility Workload Conclusions

Youth development domain. The youth development domain was defined as "utilizing the knowledge of the human growth and development process to create environments that help youth reach their full potential" (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004, p. 4). The 4-H youth development professionals who participated in this study indicated that 21.6% of their work time was spent on job responsibilities in this domain. The four job responsibilities that ranked highest in the domain involved creating and delivering programs directly to youth, while the bottom three required the 4-H youth development professionals to address someone else's behavior or their own professional development. Within the youth development domain, 4-H youth development professionals indicated that they would rather spend time working with people in a learning environment or building relationships with the people they work with than taking time to address behavior problems or their own professional growth.

Youth program development domain. The youth program development domain was defined as "the process of planning, implementing, and evaluating programs that

achieve youth development outcomes" (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004, p. 4). The 4-H youth development professionals reported spending the greatest amount of time working on job responsibilities in this domain: 27.2% of work time. Working with youth development curricula was the job responsibility that received the greatest percentage (f = 43.6%) of respondents who ranked it as one of their top two choices. Those job responsibilities within the domain on which 4-H youth development professionals spent the most time (within the top four) were all related to working with others, and the tasks included working with advisory boards, identifying and working with community partners, and working with committees and design teams to develop programs. When asked about the job responsibilities that required them to work alone, respondents ranked those tasks at the bottom of the group regarding amount of time spent on them.

Volunteerism domain. The volunteerism domain was defined as "building and maintaining volunteer management systems for the delivery of youth development programs" (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004, p. 5). One of the largest time commitments within the volunteerism domain was identified as the use of volunteer committees for programming efforts. This job responsibility ranked first for the amount of work time used. The 4-H youth development professionals reported spending the most time with those job responsibilities that focused on working directly with the volunteers in a learning environment. Job responsibilities such as "use volunteer committees" and "provide educational opportunities for volunteers" received the greatest percentage of one and two rankings, respectively, within this domain.

The job responsibility that ranked third in the amount of time spent was "complete a formal volunteer selection process." This job-related task is a required element for all 4-H

youth development programs within the six state Extension programs that participated in the study, so it was not surprising that it ranked towards the top of the responsibility list.

Equity, access, and opportunity domain. The equity, access, and opportunity domain was defined as "interacting effectively and equitably with diverse individuals and building long-term relationships with diverse communities" (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004, p. 6). This domain had the lowest percentage of reported work time within the six 4-H PRKC domains by 4-H youth development professionals. They spent 7.3% of work time on job responsibilities related to the equity, access, and opportunity domain. The rank-order results of job responsibilities within this domain revealed that 4-H youth development professionals would rather spend time talking about the theories and issues around equity, access, and opportunity, however, when it came to actually working with and supporting diverse audiences, the time commitment was minimal. A possible explanation for this result could be the limited ability to put equity, access, and opportunity theories into practice due to the lack of diverse audiences in many communities. There were 64.1% of the 4-H youth development professionals who ranked "building relationships within the community" as one of the top two in percentage of time spent (based on a ranking scale of 1 to 7, with *1 = the job responsibility where they spent the most time* and " *where they spent the least time*) in this domain. The mean for this job responsibility was 2.30. The job responsibilities that ranked second (recruit, support, and retain diverse volunteers) and third (provide training around equity, access, and opportunity) in the amount of work time spent had mean scores of 3.78 and 3.80, respectively. The 4-H youth development professionals reported spending the least amount of time making sure their advisory boards and program

participants included diverse audiences as well as developing materials that are available in alternative forms for diverse audiences.

The reason this domain may have had such a low percentage of time devoted by 4-H youth development professionals could be the lack of diversity in many of the individual geographic areas (counties). It would seem that creating materials for diverse audiences is a job responsibility for which 4-H youth development professionals who work in highly diverse populations should be spending more time. For those professionals who do not live in ethnically diverse areas, it may be hard to include diverse audiences on committees and/or groups. One course of action to increase the amount of time spent on the equity, access, and opportunity domain and its job responsibilities could be to provide professional development opportunities (such as a cultural competency training) that would convey to 4-H youth development professionals that diversity is not only about racial diversity, but can also include socio-economic status, geographic location, etc.

Partnership domain. The partnership domain was defined as "engaging youth in community development and the broader community in youth development" (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004, p. 6). In the partnership domain, the two highest-ranking job responsibilities for the amount of time used by 4-H youth development professionals were providing opportunities for youth to lead and providing work-force skills to youth. Both tasks entail the professional working directly with youth, which is similar to the results from the other domains.

Organizational management domain. When 4-H youth development professionals complete tasks within the organizational management domain, they are "positioning the organization and its people to work with and on behalf of young people

most effectively" (Stone & Rennekamp, 2004, p. 7). The job responsibilities in this domain are more about the infrastructure or policies of the organization and less about directly working with people, which may be one of the reasons 4-H youth development professionals reported that they only spent 9.1% of their work time in the organizational management domain. Job-related tasks categorized within the organizational management domain are generally more desk-type jobs. One method to ensure a quality program is for the 4-H professional to develop and support both local and state policies and procedures, which happened to be the job responsibility for which they spent the most time doing in the organizational management domain.

General Conclusions for 4-H Youth Development Workload

Many individual job responsibilities for 4-H youth development professionals were reviewed in this study. Very little was found in the literature about the question of which job responsibilities 4-H youth development professionals perform more often than others. This study provided a better understanding of the workload for 4-H youth development professionals.

There is research supporting the importance of conducting regular workload assessments for any organization (Washington State Department of Social & Health Services, 2007). A workload assessment helps the organization discover the difference between what the reality is and what should be happening as they are related to the job responsibilities being done by professionals. Based on the findings of this study, 4-H youth development professionals spend more time on those job responsibilities that involve working directly with people (what is) and less time on the job-related tasks which require time behind a desk or focusing on the infrastructure of the organization. To maintain a

high-quality program, 4-H youth development professionals may need to work on the infrastructure-related job responsibilities (what should be).

Research Question 2: Job Satisfaction Conclusions

The second research objective of this study was to determine if there were a correlation between the workload and job satisfaction of 4-H youth development professionals. The four methods used to measure job satisfaction for this research study included a self-reported level of satisfaction for each of the individual 4-H PRKC domains; the self-reported level of satisfaction for the job responsibilities of the 4-H PRKC domains; the Job Satisfaction Survey; and finally, the 4-H youth development professionals' self-reported level of overall job satisfaction.

After determining the workload of the 4-H youth development professionals, the next step was to assess the level of job satisfaction for those professionals. To properly evaluate job satisfaction, a definition for job satisfaction was established. The literature review revealed several definitions of job satisfaction (Hoppcock, 1935; Petty et. al, 2005; Spector, 1985). Spector (1985) used the definition of "an emotional affective response to a job or specific aspect of a job" (p. 695). Petty et al. (2005) stated that job satisfaction can be influenced by individual parts of a job. A better explanation would be that professionals can be satisfied with the overall job, but they may also be dissatisfied with certain portions of it. For this study, job satisfaction was measured not only for the overall level, but also on the individual elements that can contribute to a professional's level of job satisfaction.

Professionals employed in the human services/non-profit fields tend to have a higher degree of job satisfaction then other professionals (Borzaga, 2006; Petty et al., 2005). Petty et al. (2005) studied the overall job satisfaction of professionals in the field of

youth development and found that youth development professionals tended to be more satisfied with their jobs than other types of professionals. The authors suggested additional research to evaluate individual job-satisfaction factors, specifically using the Job Satisfaction Survey which was designed to measure nine different facets of job satisfaction.

4-H PRKC Domain Job Satisfaction Conclusions

After workload was determined and job satisfaction was measured for 4-H youth development professionals, a Pearson-product correlation co-efficient test was conducted to determine if a significant relationship existed between the individual variables. As a reminder, the definitions to describe the strength of the relationship between variables was (a) strong, r is between .500 and 1.00 or between -.500 and -1.00; (b) moderate, r is between .300 and .500 or between -.300 and -.500; (c) weak, r is between .100 and .300 or between -.100 and -.300; and (d) little to no relationship, r is between .000 and .100 or between -.000 and -.100.

The first measurement of job satisfaction was a self-reported level of satisfaction for each of the six 4-H PRKC domains, based on a Likert-type scale of *1 = extremely satisfied, 2 = satisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = dissatisfied,* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied.* As a group, 4-H youth development professionals were satisfied with their work within all six domains. The greatest job satisfaction was within the youth development and the youth program development domains. These domains were also ranked the highest as far as the percentage of work time. The correlation between the percentage of spent time and the level of job satisfaction revealed a weak, negative relationship for both domains. This conclusion indicates that, as the percentage of time spent working within these domains increases, the level of job satisfaction should decrease. This finding also suggests that 4-H

youth development professionals should monitor the amount of time they spend doing work in any one domain. Spending time in a variety of activities within each of the six 4-H PRKC domains may help the 4-H youth development professionals' level of job satisfaction increase rather than decrease.

A positive, moderate relationship was reported between the 4-H youth development professionals' self-reported level of satisfaction for the youth development domain and their self-reported overall job satisfaction. A positive, moderate relationship was also found for the youth program development domain. A weak, positive relationship was found between the self-reported level of job satisfaction for the volunteerism and partnership domains and the self-reported level of overall job satisfaction. For all of these domains, the data revealed that, as the 4-H youth development professionals' level of job satisfaction increases for work related specifically to the youth development and youth program development domains, their overall job satisfaction should also increase.

4-H PRKC Domains Individual Job Responsibilities' Job Satisfaction Conclusions

The second method used to measure 4-H youth development professionals' job satisfaction was reported for each of the seven individual job responsibilities related to the 4-H PRKC domains. The Likert-type scale used for this assessment was *1 = extremely satisfied, 2 = satisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = dissatisfied,* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied.*

Youth development domain. The 4-H youth development professionals reported being satisfied with all seven job responsibilities in the youth development domain. The greatest level of job satisfaction for 4-H youth development professionals was reported in developing programs for youth to practice life skills. The results of the workload portion of

this study indicated that 4-H youth development professionals spent the majority of their time on job responsibilities that allowed them to work directly with people (e.g., develop programs for youth to practice life skills; provide opportunities for youth to explore skills in project areas; create positive relationships with members, parents, leaders, and the community; and create programs for youth). The same job responsibilities had the greatest reported levels of job satisfaction for 4-H youth development professionals in the youth development domain.

A strong, positive relationship between workload and job satisfaction was found for creating youth programs. As 4-H youth development professionals create more programs for youth, their level of job satisfaction for that specific job responsibility increases. A moderately positive relationship was found between the job satisfaction of the individual job responsibility and the job satisfaction of the youth development domain. As the level of job satisfaction increased for the job responsibility, so did the level of satisfaction for the youth development domain.

The observed correlation between job satisfaction for "develop programs to practice life skills" in the youth development domain and job satisfaction for the youth development domain indicated a moderate, positive relationship. Another moderate, positive relationship was found between the rank order (workload) and level of self-reported job satisfaction for "provide opportunities to explore skills in project areas": as a 4-H youth development professional provides more opportunities for youth to explore their skills in project areas, the youth development professional's level of job satisfaction should increase. The same job responsibility had a moderate, positive relationship between the 4-H youth

development professionals' level of job satisfaction for that particular job responsibility and their overall job responsibility for the youth development domain.

The 4-H youth development professionals were generally satisfied with their job, which could be partially due to the fact that they worked with people, especially youth, on a regular basis. When those opportunities are taken away and 4-H youth development professionals have to work on other job responsibilities, such as dealing with conflict management issues, the professionals' level of job satisfaction may go down. Finding a way to successfully help 4-H youth development professionals positively manage conflict situations may help increase the professionals' level of job satisfaction for both the individual job responsibility and the youth development domain. A possible solution could be to provide training in basic mediation skills for 4-H youth development professionals so that they are better equipped with the skills needed to handle conflict.

Youth program development domain. The 4-H youth development professionals reported satisfaction with all seven job responsibilities in the youth program development domain. The job responsibility with the greatest level of reported job satisfaction was "selecting, developing, adapting, and/or utilizing quality youth development curricula." This job responsibility was the one for which 4-H youth development professionals reported spending the most time within the youth program development domain. A positive correlation was found between the workload (rank order) and the level of job satisfaction for this job responsibility. It is possible that having a quality curriculum (i.e., current and accurate) for 4-H members and volunteer leaders makes decision making easier for the 4-H youth development professional. When 4-H youth development professionals are well-prepared, volunteer leaders are not asking for additional resources for club meetings, and

when the 4-H youth development professional receives a last-minute call to do a program (such as at a school), everything is ready. One of the issues is state-level support for curriculum, development, adaption, and training. This support can have a huge impact on the county program because having someone at the state who can focus either on creating or on finding and adapting quality curriculum can alleviate this job responsibility for the county professional. It is also critical that the curriculum is age appropriate and focuses on the key elements of youth development so that it is usable for everyone.

All seven job responsibilities in the youth program development domain had a positive relationship between workload (rank order) and the reported level of job satisfaction for the individual job responsibility. For this domain, as the 4-H youth development professional spent more time on each individual job responsibility, job satisfaction for that responsibility increased. There was also a moderate, positive relationship between the 4-H youth development professionals' self-reported level of satisfaction for evaluating programs and communicating those results, and the overall level of satisfaction for the youth program development domain.

The youth program development domain correlation results provided significant relationships between the rank order (time spent on the task) and the individual job responsibility's job satisfaction or between the individual job responsibility's reported job satisfaction and the overall level of job satisfaction that was reported for the 4-H PRKC domain. All correlations were positive but varied in the level of relationship (strong, moderate, weak, and/or little to no relationship). The correlation results indicated that, as a 4-H youth development professional spends more time on individual job responsibilities

within the youth program development domain, the job satisfaction levels should increase for those job responsibilities and for the overall domain.

Volunteerism domain. The 4-H youth development professionals reported satisfaction with all seven job responsibilities in the volunteerism domain. The job responsibility with the greatest level of job satisfaction was "using volunteer committees," which also ranked highest for the amount of time 4-H youth development professionals spent on individual job responsibilities. In the volunteerism domain, positive correlations between workload rank and level of job satisfaction were found on three job responsibilities: (a) use volunteer committees, (b) provide educational opportunities for volunteers, and (c) use written position descriptions. When 4-H youth development professionals spend more time on these three job responsibilities, their job satisfaction increases.

The volunteerism domain had a positive relationship between job satisfaction for individual job responsibilities and the overall domain job satisfaction for six job responsibilities: (a) using volunteer committees, (b) conducting a formal volunteer-selection process, (c) providing educational opportunities for volunteers, (d) providing performance feedback to volunteers, (e) using written positive descriptions, and (f) recruiting volunteers. As job satisfaction increases for each of these job responsibilities, the level of job satisfaction for the volunteerism domain should also increase.

The volunteerism domain's job responsibilities with the greatest job satisfaction were those in which the 4-H youth development professional worked directly with others (using volunteer committees and providing educational opportunities). There was also a significant, positive correlation between the 4-H youth development professional's self-

reported level of satisfaction for the job responsibility and workload and between the overall volunteer domain job satisfaction and rank order.

Equity, access, and opportunity domain. The 4-H youth development professionals reported that they were satisfied with the individual job responsibilities in the equity, access, and opportunity domain. "Building relationships within the community" had the greatest reported job satisfaction and was the job responsibility where the most time was spent. A positive, moderate relationship between the workload (rank order) and the level of job satisfaction for the job responsibility was also found.

All seven of the equity, access, and opportunity domain job responsibilities had a significant, positive relationship between the reported level of job satisfaction for the job responsibility and job satisfaction for the domain. Six of the seven job responsibilities in this domain had a positive relationship between the level of job satisfaction for the individual job responsibilities and the self-reported level of overall job satisfaction. These relationships suggest that, as job satisfaction for individual job responsibilities within the domain increases, so does the overall job satisfaction.

Partnership domain. The 4-H youth development professionals reported satisfaction with the seven job responsibilities in the partnership domain. The job responsibility "provide opportunities for youth to lead" had the greatest level of job satisfaction. It was also where 4-H youth development professionals said they spent the most time in the partnership domain.

While there were no significant relationships within the partnership domain, there were six job responsibilities with a positive relationship between the workload rank and job satisfaction for the individual responsibilities. "Facilitate youth involvement on 4-H

committees and boards" had a positive, moderate relationship between rank (workload) and job satisfaction, meaning that, when the amount of time (or rank order) a 4-H youth development professional spends working on this job responsibility increases, job satisfaction should also increase. The other five job responsibilities (advocate for youth engagement, involved in community coalitions, provide work-force skills to youth, support youth who are working on community change, and work with current boards and committees to increase youth involvement) had a positive, weak relationship between the workload and job-satisfaction variables. The correlation results indicated a relationship between the workload of 4-H youth development professionals and the level of job satisfaction with the individual job responsibilities (as workload increases, so does job satisfaction); it was not a significant or a very strong relationship.

Organizational management domain. The 4-H youth development professionals reported satisfaction with the seven job responsibilities in the organizational management domain. The greatest job satisfaction was reported for involvement in professional associations. The correlation for this job responsibility indicated a positive, moderate relationship between workload (rank order) and satisfaction with the job responsibility, which would indicate being involved in professional associations is one way to increase a 4-H youth development professional's job satisfaction level. A positive correlation was also found between workload and job satisfaction for "conducting research and sharing that research." In other words, the more 4-H youth development professionals conduct research, the more their level of job satisfaction for that particular job responsibility should increase.

4-H PRKC domain job satisfaction results for the land-grant university aggregated group. When an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted between the

4-H youth development professionals' self-reported job satisfaction scores for the six domains and the individual job responsibilities, several significant differences were found between variables for the individual land-grant universities (LGUs) included in this study.

Within the youth program development domain's job responsibility "identify and work with community partners," the UI 4-H youth development professionals had a self-reported job satisfaction mean that was significantly greater than the 4-H youth development professionals from OSU, WSU, MSU, and CSU. All six land-grant university 4-H youth development professionals reported that they were satisfied with the job responsibility, but the UI 4-H youth development professionals were slightly satisfied with this job responsibility.

For the job responsibility "recognize volunteers" in the volunteerism domain, all land-grant university aggregated groups reported that they were satisfied with the job responsibility, but the CSU 4-H youth development professionals had the greatest level of job satisfaction. Support from a state volunteer specialist may be one reason for this greater job satisfaction. This position helps guide volunteer management issues as well as providing professional development opportunities to both volunteers and 4-H youth development professionals. State volunteer specialists can also help county 4-H youth development professionals when faced with volunteer issues, and the specialists may be able to help solve conflict issues. This support could help increase the 4-H youth development professionals' job satisfaction and lower their burnout because there is someone to help. Within the volunteerism domain, when CSU 4-H youth development professionals were recruiting volunteers, they reported a lower job satisfaction than 4-H youth development professionals from UI, OSU, and UW. The 4-H youth development

professionals at OSU and UW reported that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with this job responsibility while the professionals at CSU and UI were satisfied with the job responsibility.

Job Satisfaction Survey Conclusions

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) measured the level of satisfaction within nine facets as well as overall job satisfaction. According to Spector (1985), the scale used to interpret the level of job satisfaction for the JSS was as follows: (a) a mean score above a 4.51 indicated satisfaction; (b) a mean between 3.50-4.50 indicated slight satisfaction or dissatisfaction (4.00 to 4.50 was slight satisfaction and 3.50 to 3.99 was slight dissatisfaction); and (c) a mean below 3.49 indicated dissatisfaction.

According to the literature (Borzaga, 2006; Petty et al., 2005), professionals in the human development field have a greater level of job satisfaction than professionals in similar fields. The results for the overall JSS score for this study indicated that 4-H youth development professionals were slightly satisfied with their jobs ($M = 3.72$), which supports the previous literature findings.

The 4-H youth development professionals reported satisfaction with all 42 job responsibilities (seven job responsibilities in each of the six domains) related to the 4-H PRKC. This result, together with the JSS score, indicated that 4-H youth development professionals are satisfied with their jobs.

Nine JSS facet conclusions. According to the JSS interpretation scale, 4-H youth development professionals indicated dissatisfaction with three facets (pay: $M = 2.71$; promotion: $M = 2.77$; and operating conditions: $M = 2.99$). The 4-H youth development professionals reported that they were satisfied with the supervision ($M = 4.60$) and nature

of work facets (M = 4.93). For four facets, 4-H youth development professionals reported a slight degree of either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Of those four, three mean scores were below a 4.0, denoting a slight degree of dissatisfaction (contingent rewards: M = 3.58; co-worker: M = 3.99; and communication: M = 3.80), and the fourth facet had a mean over 4.00, denoting a slight degree of satisfaction (fringe benefits: M = 4.13). These findings further support the idea of Castillo and Cano (1999) who said that factors, such as pay, working conditions, supervision, policies, and interpersonal relationships, can lead to job dissatisfaction. Castillo and Cano's (1999) findings also indicated that 4-H youth development professionals were dissatisfied with the pay and operating conditions, a finding which is complemented by the results of this study. There are similarities between the attitudes expressed by 4-H youth development professionals in this study and those described by Castillo and Cano (1999) who listed achievement of the work itself, recognition, responsibilities, and advancement as factors that can lead to job satisfaction.

The 4-H youth development professionals who participated in this study reported satisfaction with the nature of the work facet. The current study results are supported by Watson and Hillison (1991) who found that intrinsic factors often lead to greater levels of job satisfaction. The statements within the nature of work facet were all related to intrinsic motivations (e.g., I sometimes feel my job is meaningless, I like doing the things I do at work, I feel a sense of pride in doing my work, and my job is enjoyable).

The 4-H youth development professionals indicated that they were dissatisfied with the statements within the operating conditions facet. One of the statements, "I have too much to do at work" (M = 2.33), showed evidence that the 4-H youth development professionals were dissatisfied with this aspect of their job. Having too much to do at work

can include hours worked beyond the regular 40-hour work week. This study reinforced the findings of previous work on this topic which found that night and weekend work is common and an important factor in job dissatisfaction (Astroth & Lindstrom, 2008; Church & Pals, 1982; Stark, 2008). Church and Pals (1982) found that evening and weekend work was a factor that influenced an Extension professional to leave the job. Based on prior research, it is suggested that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and turnover (Astroth & Lindstrom, 2008; Castillo & Cano, 1999). When there is too much work to do, 4-H youth development professionals may chose to leave their job within a few years.

The 4-H youth development profession is seeing a trend of more county program assistants or county program coordinators (also classified as paraprofessionals) doing the day-to-day work of the 4-H program. These positions often require a high school diploma, associate's degree, or bachelor's degree (Astroth, 2007). A possible explanation for the lower degree requirements might be that the positions usually have a lower salary (which also means lower fringe-benefit costs). The LGU's Extension administration is able to hire more 4-H youth development professionals for the same amount of money. For example, the LGU Extension administration has $60,000 to hire a 4-H professional at the faculty level. The same amount of money allows the university to hire two paraprofessionals. A reasonable approach could be to hire more 4-H youth development professionals who are classified as paraprofessionals, which may then benefit the organization and possibly lower the workload for 4-H youth development professionals. It is important to determine what skill sets new 4-H youth development professionals possess when they begin a position. This knowledge will help the administration tailor professional development opportunities

to meet the immediate needs of new professionals to assure they are prepared to do the work.

Heavy workload is not only a problem for county 4-H youth development professionals, but can also contribute to the level of job satisfaction and burnout for professionals who work at the state level. It may be beneficial to hire additional state 4-H youth development professionals who perform tasks that are event-management related. When comparing county and state positions, the state Extension associates would be similar to the county program coordinators due to a lower salary and the non-faculty status within the university system. The administration would be able to hire two state-level non-faculty 4-H professionals to fill positions for approximately the same cost to hire one faculty-level 4-H specialist. It is important to hire additional 4-H youth development professionals, but a balance between non-faculty status positions, or paraprofessionals, and faculty positions is critical. County Extension educator and state specialist positions must not be ignored or eliminated to save money. All 4-H youth development professionals have an important role that helps meet the needs of the youth.

Castillo and Cano (1999) reported that the work itself, recognition, responsibilities, and advancement all affect job satisfaction. The 4-H youth development professionals reported job dissatisfaction for the promotion facet. To improve the level of job satisfaction, 4-H youth development professionals need to see more opportunities for advancement within the organization. There may be several possible explanations for this result. For many 4-H youth development professionals, including the 29% who are county program assistants, county program coordinators, and the state Extension associates, the opportunity for advancement within the profession usually requires an advanced degree.

Another explanation for dissatisfaction could be that many individuals in these positions are county-paid employees and may not receive the same tuition discounts as those paid by a university. Dissatisfaction with the tuition discount, coupled with a lower salary, may be a deterrent for individuals who wish to continue their education.

The 4-H youth development professionals were slightly dissatisfied with the statements in the contingent rewards facet. There are simple ways to improve job satisfaction and to reward professionals for their work without costing the organization any money. For example, the organization could recognize a 4-H youth development professional who has done an exceptional job in a newsletter or with a handwritten note.

Job satisfaction survey results for aggregated groups. The 4-H youth development professionals reported being dissatisfied with the JSS statement "raises are few and far between." The UI county Extension educators (CEEs) had a greater level of agreement with this statement, after the scores were reversed, than the UW CEEs. This study further supported the idea that pay is one of the reasons for job dissatisfaction and may be a reason people leave a job (Borzaga, 2006; Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo & Cano, 1999; Long & Swortzel, 2007; Voke, 2002).

For the co-worker facet statements, the UW CEEs reported disagreement more often than other LGU CEEs. For the statement "I like the people I work with," the UW CEEs slightly disagreed ($M = 3.80$) with the statement, which was lower than the other LGU CEEs (UI, OSU, WSU, MSU, and CSU), who moderately agreed with the statement. The UW CEEs had a lower mean for the statement "I enjoy my co-workers" than UI, MSU, and CSU CEEs. The mean of the UW CEEs for the statement "there is too much bickering and fighting at work" was lower than MSU and CSU CEEs. These results were similar to

Castillo and Cano (1999) who found that interpersonal relationships can be a factor for job dissatisfaction.

The UI 4-H youth development professionals consistently had a lower reported level of job satisfaction for the fringe benefits facet. These results may be due to the fact that 4-H youth development professionals who are classified as county program assistants or county program coordinators are paid by county-appropriated funds and have different fringe benefits than the university-paid professionals. An example of fringe-benefit differences at UI is the reduction in tuition costs at state institutions of higher education that is not available to 4-H youth development professionals who paid with county funds. Without tuition-cost assistance, many county program assistants and county program coordinators may not see an advanced degree as worthwhile in order to move forward in their career.

Another difference between 4-H youth development professionals by primary job title was within the communications facet. The county program assistant group did not feel the goals of the organization were communicated clearly to them. One reason for this attitude could be that this group is not always given the opportunity to attend professional-development conferences, such as the Extension Annual Conference, where much of the organizational communication occurs because, often, they are not considered to be university faculty. For some states, the professional-development conferences are only be open to university-paid professionals. There is, therefore, a need to participate in all professional development activities so that the 4-H professionals feel as if they are part of the organization and have input in the organization's goals and direction. It is also recommended that all states implement a plan to communicate with all levels of 4-H youth development professionals, not just the university-paid professionals.

Further research is needed to establish how the fringe benefits available to county-paid professionals and the types of opportunities they are given for professional development affect their job satisfaction. By understanding these two aspects, steps could be recommended to increase the 4-H youth development professionals' level of job satisfaction as it relates to these two facets.

Self-Reported Overall Job Satisfaction Conclusions

The mean for the self-reported overall job satisfaction for the 4-H youth development professionals was 2.20 which, according to the scale (*1 = extremely satisfied, 2 = satisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = dissatisfied,* and *5 = extremely dissatisfied*), indicated that 4-H youth development professionals are satisfied with their jobs. These findings support previous research which indicated that those who work in youth development are generally satisfied with their jobs (Borzaga, 2006; Evans et al., 2009; Petty et al., 2005). In a study by Evans et al. (2009), 81% of the youth development professionals reported being satisfied with their job. The present study had similar results in that 79.2% of the 4-H youth development professionals were either extremely satisfied or satisfied with their job.

Research Question 3: Burnout Conclusions

This study was designed to determine the correlation between workload and burnout for 4-H youth development professionals. Earlier research reported that Extension professionals tend to experience low degrees of burnout. The 4-H youth development professionals had a greater degree of burnout than any other Extension discipline (Igodan & Newcomb, 1986). Croom (2003) cited the reasons for burnout, including work overload, lack of control over one's work environment, lack of community among co-workers, lack of

fairness in work assignments, and an uneven distribution or absence of rewards. The relationship between workload and burnout is important to understand because, according to Maslach and Jackson (1981), burnout can lead to job turnover or decreased performance. The current study results support the previous research findings.

4-H PRKC Domain Burnout Conclusions

Determining the degree of burnout for 4-H youth development professionals began by the study participants self-reporting their degree of burnout related to each of the six 4-H PRKC domains. For five of the six domains, 4-H youth development professionals reported a very small to a small degree of burnout. The only domain where the 4-H youth development professionals reported that they were somewhat burned out was within the volunteerism domain, with 44% of the respondents reporting a large to very large degree of burnout. The youth development domain caused 4-H youth development professionals the least amount of burnout.

A significant correlation was found between the percentage of time spent within the domain and the reported degree of burnout in five of the six domains. A positive relationship between the percentage of time spent and the degree of burnout was found in the following domains: youth development; youth program development; partnership; organizational management; and equity, access, and opportunity. When workload (or percentage of time spent) increases, the degree of burnout 4-H youth development professionals experience should increase as well. A similar relationship was established for job satisfaction and workload. Based on the positive relationship between workload and both job satisfaction and burnout, it is important that 4-H youth development professionals

not spend all of their time in any one domain. It could cause their level of burnout to increase and their job satisfaction to decrease.

Individual 4-H PRKC Job Responsibility Conclusions

The rank order of time spent on job responsibilities, the level of job satisfaction, and the degree of burnout for each job responsibility indicated that the preferred job responsibility involved working directly with people. The level of job satisfaction was greater and the degree of burnout was lower when 4-H youth development professionals had direct contact with youth and volunteers. Similar to the present study's results, the literature revealed that teachers have a desire to impact their classroom and students, but as the non-instructional duties increase, their degree of burnout also increases (Croom, 2002). A greater degree of burnout was felt by 4-H youth development professionals when they were unable to work directly with others. The possible reasons and recommendations given for job satisfaction and workload are also applicable to burnout and workload. As with the low level of job satisfaction related to job responsibilities involving evaluation, 4-H youth development professionals also reported that evaluation causes them a greater degree of burnout. One potential recommendation for Extension administration to consider would be to give 4-H youth development professionals the skills needed to conduct simple evaluation studies through professional development opportunities. Gaining these skills may increase their confidence to conduct the evaluation and to communicate the results to stakeholders.

Overall, 4-H youth development professionals did not report a high degree of burnout, but there are indications that they had a greater degree of burnout related to specific job responsibilities within the 4-H PRKC. The greatest degree of burnout reported was in the youth development domain for the task "dealing with conflict management."

with 16.8% of 4-H youth development professionals reporting a very high degree of burnout. There was a significant, negative, moderate correlation found between the workload (rank order) and the degree of burnout for this job responsibility. The negative relationship implied that, as the rank, or the amount of time the 4-H youth development professionals spent on the job responsibility, increased, the degree of burnout would decrease. It seems possible that the more a 4-H youth development professional handles issues of conflict, the easier it should become. Professional development opportunities that provide conflict-management and mediation-skill development, including practical applications or role-playing, can help the 4-H youth development professional understand how to confront conflict situations.

The other job responsibility with a significant, moderate relationship between the workload (rank order) and the job responsibility's degree of burnout was the youth development domain job responsibility "provide opportunities for youth to explore skills in project areas." As the workload, or rank order, increased, the degree of burnout decreased. The same job responsibility had a negative relationship between the workload rank score and the degree of overall burnout. When 4-H youth development professionals spent more time on the job responsibility, their degree of overall burnout decreased. An explanation may be that, because 4-H youth development professionals prefer to work with people, it can be rejuvenating for the professional when a youth who has previously not succeeded finally finds the one thing where he or she can be successful.

The youth program development; volunteerism; and equity, access, and opportunity domains did not reveal any significant relationships between the workload and burnout variables. Within the partnership domain, there were two job responsibilities with

significant, positive, weak relationships. The first of those relationships was between workload (rank order score) and the degree of burnout for the job responsibility "facilitate youth involvement in 4-H boards and committees." The positive relationship means that as the workload increased, the degree of burnout would also increase. This result may be explained by a number factors. First, working with adults and youth on boards and committees may be exhausting for 4-H youth development professionals because they have to play advocate or mediator between the youth and adults. There are other times when the adult just wants to get the job done without youth input, which may cause the youth to feel like they are being told what to do instead of being part of the decision-making process. Finding balance can develop competencies in both the adults and youth, thus making it easier to delegate more responsibilities to the boards and committees with whom the 4-H youth development professional works. To be successful, it is important to evaluate the attitude of the board and committee members to determine if they are truly committed to the youth-adult partnership.

Finally, there were two job responsibilities within the organizational management domain that had a significant relationship between the workload rank score and the degree of burnout. There was a positive relationship between workload and burnout for the job responsibility "develops and supports both local and state policies and procedures." The more a 4-H youth development professional performs that task, the degree of burnout should increase as well. For the job responsibility "collect and report data and enrollments," there was a negative relationship between workload and burnout. The more a 4-H youth development professional completed that task, the lower the burnout should be.

The reason could be similar to the conflict management and evaluation job responsibilities, wherein the more one completes a task, the easier it should become.

Burnout Survey Conclusions

To assess the 4-H youth development professional's degree of job burnout, a burnout survey was used. The burnout survey consisted of 40 questions created or adapted from previous research (Borritz & Kristensen, 2004; Livestrong, 2010; Mind Tools, 2010; New Unionism Network, 2004). The average overall burnout score for the study population was 3.84, which showed that 4-H youth development professionals were slightly burned out. A burnout survey mean score of 2.99 and below is evidence that there is little to no burnout; M = 3.00 to 4.99 is evidence for a slight degree of burnout; and M 5.00 and above is evidence for burnout.

The statement "I feel there is more work to do than I have the ability to do." had a mean of 4.10, indicating agreement with the statement; based on the survey scale, this finding showed a large degree of burnout. Previous research found that workload can be a factor for burnout (Croom, 2002; Rousan & Henderson, 1996). It seems possible that the degree of burnout may be influenced by the 4-H youth development professionals trying to keep up with the amount of work they currently have and are expected to do.

This study was limited to 56 of a possible 294 job-related competencies or responsibilities in the 4-H PRKC. The total number of potential job responsibilities is one example of the large workload for 4-H youth development professionals. Future research should concentrate on the other job responsibilities to determine if there is a relationship between them and job satisfaction or burnout.

The findings suggest several courses of action to reduce the workload for 4-H youth development professionals. The first solution would be to hire additional 4-H professionals to meet the needs of both clientele (4-H members and volunteers) and the stakeholders (e.g., university administration, county commissioners, and grant funders). The number of job responsibilities that individual 4-H youth development professionals are expected to perform could be assigned strategically so that one person is not expected to complete all 294 potential job responsibilities or even the 56 reviewed in this study. To further support this recommendation, Astroth (2007) advocated for an increase in the number of 4-H youth development professionals because of the burnout and excessive workloads of 4-H youth development professionals. These recommendations are contrary to what is currently happening in Extension across the country. Astroth (2007) reported that states are seeing a decrease in the number of state and county professionals.

The second solution to alleviate the feeling of too much work to complete would be to have 4-H youth development professionals at all levels evaluate the number and types of programs currently offered and to possibly scale down the number offered unless funded through grants (soft-dollars). By critically looking at the programs offered could help eliminate the number of job responsibilities 4-H youth development professionals are expected to perform. Programs involving youth-adult partnerships are an example of possible programs to eliminate. The study results indicated that 4-H youth development professionals only spent 14.2% of their time in the partnership domain, compared to 69.5% of their time being spent within the youth development, youth program development, and volunteerism domains. By eliminating some of the tasks within the partnership domain,

there could be more time to work on job responsibilities from which 4-H youth development professionals gain more satisfaction, causing less burnout.

Burnout survey aggregated group conclusions. Based on the ANOVA test, the aggregated group results had a significant difference for the burnout survey statement "I worry about losing my job." between UW and four other LGUs (OSU, WSU, MSU, and CSU), with 4-H youth development professionals at UW having a lower degree of burnout. The severe budget cuts, referenced by Fischer (2009), in several states (Ohio, Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, Louisiana, Idaho, and Oregon) could be one reason for this difference.

Self-Reported Overall Burnout Conclusions

The 4-H youth development professionals reported a very small to small degree of overall burnout related to their job. The results revealed a strong, significant, negative relationship between the burnout survey overall score and the self-reported overall burnout mean; in other words, as the burnout survey overall score increased, the 4-H youth development professionals' self-reported degree of overall burnout decreased. The burnout survey contained statements related to the 4-H youth development professionals' attitude towards the amount of work, co-workers, physical and emotional well-being, and mental state. It is possible to hypothesize that the relationship may influence a professional's overall degree of burnout. However, more research on this topic is needed before an association between the individual statements of the burnout survey and the overall degree of burnout of 4-H youth development professionals can be clearly understood.

Recommendations for Educators and Practitioners

This study had a number of implications for both 4-H youth development professionals and the individuals who supervise them. The literature review indicated a

relationship between job satisfaction and burnout to employee turnover (Rousan & Henderson, 1996; Safrit et al., 2009; Strong & Harder, 2009). The present study provided additional evidence that 4-H youth development professionals are slightly burned out, but generally satisfied, with their job. Implications and recommendations for 4-H youth development professional or the people who supervise 4-H youth development professionals are summarized in this section.

The first recommendation derived from the results of this study was that position descriptions should accurately reflect the work of 4-H youth development professionals and that performance evaluations should be based on the position description. The administration needs to recognize the differences between the responsibilities of 4-H youth development professionals and other Extension professionals. To determine the differences, the administration should evaluate the current position descriptions used by both 4-H youth development and other Extension professionals. Understanding the programming trends for the 4-H youth development profession is vital to comprehend what type of job responsibilities are required for 4-H youth development professionals. An example is the current attention to science, engineering, and technology (SET) programs, which is a mission mandate of 4-H National Headquarters. It is expected that each state will conduct SET programming. Extension administration should support programming areas which move the organization forward.

The 4-H youth development professionals are often expected to work beyond the normal 40-hour work week. Another issue that emerged from this study was that 4-H youth development professionals are dissatisfied with the amount of work currently expected of them. It is important for the supervisors of 4-H youth development professionals to

understand the work and time involved during weekend and evening meetings. Supervisors should be aware of the evenings and weekends that 4-H youth development professionals work to understand the extra time accrued and to help the supervisor establish the role the 4-H youth development professional should play in those meetings or events. If the current policies of the organization do not support the needs of the professional, a policy should be researched to determine how the 4-H youth development professional will be compensated for the extra hours. These policies should be in place for all Extension employees, not just 4-H youth development professionals.

Flexible hours or formal compensation are two options to consider. Supervisors need to be supportive of the professionals' personal needs. The 4-H youth development professionals may have worked nights or weekends, so they may need to take time off during the normal work week to do personal errands. It could also be as simple as not expecting an Extension professional to be in the office as soon as it opens if there were a meeting the night before. This arrangement needs to be agreed upon at the beginning of an Extension professional's career and should be communicated with colleagues in the office.

The results of this study indicated that 4-H youth development professionals prefer to work with others. The correlations were positive for job responsibilities that involved working with others. This correlation means that, as the workload goes down, the level of job satisfaction rises. Working with others allows the workload to be distributed among the team members, decreasing the workload of 4-H professionals. For example, a team of 4-H youth development professionals located in close physical proximity could be divided by programming interests. The 4-H professional with a stronger background in meat animal projects could take the lead for that programming area in the geographic region. Another

person could take the lead for science, engineering, and technology (SET) programming. This method of workload distribution may require changes to state or county policy regarding how the workload is dispersed and the travel boundaries. Extension administration may need to evaluate current policies to determine if this model is feasible or how it could be accomplished. This change may take a combination of administration and 4-H youth development team members to develop a plan to make the team concept work. The administration may need to approach stakeholders to explain the plan and benefits to the county.

This study suggested a need to recognize 4-H youth development professionals who are doing a good job. This appreciation could be as simple as an acknowledgement in a newsletter or a formal award, but recognition is critical to increasing the job satisfaction of 4-H youth development professionals.

There is a need to provide professional development opportunities that support the 4-H PRKC competencies. When planning these professional development opportunities, it would be beneficial to conduct a needs assessment to determine the skill sets of the 4-H youth development professionals. If 4-H youth development professionals indicate a need for help with evaluation, then training should be offered. Another example could involve working with volunteer committees. This study revealed that 4-H youth development professionals spend a lot of time working with volunteer committees. Part of the skill set needed to successfully work with committees is good facilitation skills. To help guide the type of training needed and to assure that 4-H youth development professionals are competent when working with volunteer committees, it is crucial to know what skills the professionals possess.

This study indicated that 4-H youth development professionals spend the majority of their time within the youth program development domain in selecting, developing, adapting, and/or utilizing quality youth development curriculum; 4-H youth development is highly regarded in the field of human development because of the research-based, quality programs it delivers. There should be support for the county-based professionals who are on the front lines delivering the programs to youth and volunteers for this job responsibility. A reasonable approach to address this issue could be to make sure there is a state-level professional dedicated to curriculum who can provide support to county professionals.

The 4-H youth development professionals disagreed with the statements related to organizational communication that were in the communications facet of the Job Satisfaction Survey. Based on the disagreement with these statements, 4-H youth development professionals do not feel that the organization communicates effectively with them, especially during times of severe budget cuts. The 4-H youth development professionals who completed this study reported that knowing the direction of the organization was important. The 4-H youth development professionals also value effective communication from administration regarding organizational goals. This finding suggests that a core need to seek input from all 4-H youth development professionals regarding the organization's direction is critical. It is suggested that the administration should gather input from professionals who are directly affected by changes during the decision-making process. Depending on the land-grant university, county program assistants and county program coordinators who are paid through county funds are not always invited to participate in university-sponsored professional development or planning opportunities.

Everyone on the 4-H youth development team should be invited to participate in the professional development opportunities and planning sessions in order to share their expertise as front-line professionals.

Exit interviews should be conducted with the 4-H youth development professionals who leave the organization before retirement to determine why they leave. There should be a set of pre-determined questions to help identify if any of the factors identified in this study had an effect on an individual's decision to leave the organization.

Recommendations for Further Study

Similar studies should be conducted within the other Extension disciplines, such as agriculture, family and consumer science, or community development, to compare the results to determine if a relationship exists between workload and job satisfaction and/or burnout. To make positive changes for the 4-H youth development profession, workload studies should be conducted every two to three years to determine where 4-H youth development professionals are spending their work time as well as what support is needed to change policies for excess work hours, compensation, professional development opportunities, or additional professionals to share the workload.

Further research is needed to investigate how 4-H youth development professionals handle their workload or are compensated for excessive work hours. Understanding the current situation would help Extension administration and 4-H youth development professionals know how to precede with the goal of increasing job satisfaction and lowering burnout.

One of the methods used to measure job satisfaction was the Job Satisfaction Survey. After reviewing the data and results, the researcher recommends that this

instrument not be used in the future. The discrepancy between using an agreement scale and how that scale correlates to measuring job satisfaction made for difficult analysis. The validity of the instrument when an agreement scale is used to measure satisfaction was questioned. The literature did not indicate a link between the level of agreement and the measurement of satisfaction. In the future, the recommendation is to measure job satisfaction and burnout for the individual 4-H PRKC domains, each job responsibility, and the overall job satisfaction/burnout using a self-reporting scale.

The 4-H youth development professionals are faced with several job responsibilities that are non-negotiable. One example is completing the formal volunteer-selection process. A need exists to assess the effects of these types of required job responsibilities on job satisfaction and burnout.

To better comprehend the differences between various 4-H youth development professional demographic groups, a recommendation would be to dissect the current study data by gender, age, degree requirements, and/or length of service to determine if these variables would factor into the level of job satisfaction and/or the degree of burnout for 4-H youth development professionals.

Future studies using the same population are recommended to evaluate workload, job satisfaction, and burnout. These findings could enhance the understanding of the youth development profession, trends in employment longevity, and which job responsibilities influence a 4-H youth development professional's desire to stay with an organization.

With all the budget cuts and reductions, it is even more important to retain highly qualified educators who will move the Cooperative Extension Service forward and maintain its success now and in the future (Cooper & Graham, 2001). Burnout is a serious

issue that can lead to decreased productivity for the employee and increased costs for the employer. Based on the previous research on workload, burnout, and job satisfaction, 4-H youth development professionals are prime candidates for experiencing low job satisfaction and increased burnout, which may lead to professionals leaving the organization early. The results of this study further inform Extension Administrators related to staff retention. Those in administrative roles should pay close attention to (a) programming trends in 4-H youth development, as they can relate to job responsibilities, (b) amount of hours a 4-H youth development professional is working, (c) communication techniques used to convey the goals of the organization to all 4-H youth development professionals, and (d) reasons why 4-H youth development professionals chose to leave the organization to maintain the most productive Extension workforce for the 21st Century.

REFERENCES

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2003). *The unsolved challenge of system reform: The condition of the frontline human services workforce*. Retrieved from http://www.aecf.org/upload/publicationfiles/the%20unsolved%20challenge.pdf

Astroth, K. A. (2007, Fall). Making the best better: 4-H staffing patterns and trends in the largest professional network in the nation. *Journal of Youth Development: Bridging Research and Practice, 2*(2). Retrieved from http://data.memberclicks.com/site/nae4a/JYD_070202final.pdf

Astroth, K. A., & Lindstrom, J. (2008). Investing in professional development: Building and sustaining a viable 4-H youth workforce for the future. *Journal of Youth Development, 3*(2). Retrieved from http://data.memberclicks.com/site/nae4a/JYD_080302final.pdf

Babkirk, D. G., & Davis, N. R. (1982). The incredible balancing act. *Journal of Extension, 20*(5), 5-6.

Bachtel, D. C. (1989). Where are future agents coming from? *Journal of Extension, 27*(3). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1989fall/rb2.php

Barrick, R. K. (1989). Burnout and job satisfaction of vocational supervisors. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 30*(4), 35-41.

Bartholomew, H. M., & Smith, K. L. (1990). Stresses of multicounty agent positions. *Journal of Extension, 28*(4). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1990winter/a2.php

Bartol, K. M. (1979). Individual versus organizational predictors of job satisfaction and turnover among professionals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 15*, 55-76.

Baum, J. F., & Youngblood, A. A. (1975). Impact of organizational control policy on absenteeism, performance, and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 688-694.

Bennett, S., Plint, A., & Clifford, T. J. (2005). Burnout, psychological morbidity, job satisfaction and stress: A survey of Canadian hospital based child protection professionals. *Archives of Disease in Childhood, 90*(11), 1112-1116.

Boone, Jr., H. N. (2003). Problems of agricultural education teachers: Beginning and current. *Proceedings of the American Association for Agricultural Education Research Conference*, Orlando, FL. Retrieved from http://www.aaaeonline.org/uploads/allconferences/4821proceedings.pdf

Borr, M. L., & Young, R. B. (2010). Retirement and attrition trends in Extension professionals in North Dakota. *Journal of Extension, 48*(1). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2010february/rb4.php

Borritz, M., & Kristensen, T. S. (2004). *Copenhagen Burnout Inventory*. Copenhagen, Denmark: National Institute of Occupational Health. Retrieved from http://www.arbejdsmiljoforskning.dk/upload/omi/copenhagen%20burnout%20inventory%20-%20normative%20data%20from%20a%20representative%20danish%20population.pdf

Borzaga, C. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 35*(2), 225-248.

Bowen, C. F., Radhakrishna, R., & Keyser, R. (1994). Job satisfaction and commitment of 4-H agents. *Journal of Extension, 32*(1). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1994june/rb2.html

Brayfield, A., & Roth, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35*, 307-311.

Bruening, T. H., & Hoover, T. S. (1991). Personal life factors as related to effectiveness and satisfaction of secondary agricultural teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 32*(4), 37-43.

Cano, J., & Miller, G. (1992). A gender analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfier factors, and job dissatisfer factors of agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 33*(3), 40-46.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: The Task Force on Teaching as a Profession.

Carrell, M. (1976). How to measure job satisfaction. *Training, 13*, 25-27.

Castillo, J. X., & Cano, J. (1999). A comparative analysis of Ohio agriculture teachers' level of job satisfaction. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 40*(4), 67-79.

Chapman, D. W., & Green, M. S. (1986). Teacher retention: A further examination. *Educational Research, 79*(5), 272-278.

Chase, C. L. (1986). How 2,000 teachers view their profession. *Educational Digest, 51*(8), 40-42.

Church, L. J., & Pals, D. A. (1982). Before you resign. *Journal of Extension, 20*(5), 43-49.

Clark, R. W. (1992). Stress and turnover among Extension directors. *Journal of Extension, 30*(2). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1992summer/rb1.html

Colorado State University. (2010). Personnel Directory. Retrieved from www.ext.colostate.edu/cdirectory/

Cooper, A. W., & Graham, D. L. (2001). Competencies needed to be successful county agents and county supervisors. *Journal of Extension, 39*(1). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2001february/rb3.php

Croom, B. (2003). Teacher burnout in agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 44*(2). Retrieved from http://www.pubs.aged.tamu.edu/jae/pdf/vol44/44-02-01.pdf

Crossgrove, J., Scheer, S. D., Conklin, N. L., Jones, J. M., & Safrit, R. D. (2005). Organizational values perceived as evident among Ohio State University Extension personnel. *Journal of Extension, 43*(5). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2005october/rb6.shtml

Daly, C. J., & Dee, J. R. (2006). Greener pastures: Faculty turnover intent in urban public universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(5). Retrieved from http://www.ohiostatepress.org/Journals/JHE/jhemain.htm

de los Santos, S., & Not-land, E. (1994). Factors related to commitment of Extension professionals in the Dominican Republic: Implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 35*(5). Retrieved from http://pubs.aged.tamu.edu/jae/pdf/vol35/35-03-57.pdf

Evans, W. P., Sicafuse, L. L., & Killian, E. (2009). 4-H youth worker characteristics: Comparisons with workers from other youth-serving organizations. *Journal of Extension, 47*(6). Retrieved from http://joe.org/joe/2009december/rb4.php

Farber, B. A. (1983). *Stress and burnout in the human service profession*. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Fetsch, R. J., & Kennington, M. S. (1997). Balancing work and family in Cooperative Extension: History, effective programs, and future directions. *Journal of Extension, 35*(1). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/jor/1997february/a2.html

Fischer, K. (2009, December 13). Economy forces land-grant universities to reshape Extension work. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Economy-Forces-Land-Grant/49456

Flowers, J., & Pepple, J. D. (1988). Assessment of the morale of beginning vocational agriculture teachers in Illinois. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 61*, 2-6.

Frauenheim, E. (2006). Studies: More workers look to switch jobs. *Workforce Management, 85*(3), 12.

Gliem, R. R., & Gliem, J. A. (2001). Job satisfaction of civil service and administrative and professional staff in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences. *Proceedings of the American Association for Agricultural Education Research Conference, 28*, 333-346.

Graham, C. L. (1997). All I needed to know and didn't learn in kindergarten-I learned from working in Extension. *Journal of Extension, 35*(4). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1997august/comm1.html

Greiner, C. S., & Smith, B. (2006). Determining the effect of selected variables on teacher retention. *Education, 126*(4), 653-659.

Gunn, B. A. (1978). Vacation skipping: An occupational hazard. *Journal of Extension, 16*(3), 6-9. Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1978may/78-3-a1.pdf

Harder, A., & Dooley, K. E. (2007). Perceptions of important competencies for early-career and established 4-H agents. *Journal of Southern Agricultural Education Research, 57*(1), 43-52.

Hawkins, L. F. (1982). The delicate balance: Work and family. *Journal of Extension, 20*(5), 38-42.

Herbert, M., & Kotrlik, J. W. (1990). Effects of spousal satisfaction and selected career factors on job satisfaction of Extension agents. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 31*(3), 31-37.

Homan, G., Kleinschmidt, A., Bowen-Ellzey, N., & Trice, C. (2006). An analysis of split-director administrative positions within Ohio State University Extension. *Journal of Extension, 44*(3). Retrieved from http://www.joe/org/joe/2006june/rb9.php

Hoppcock, R. H. (1935). *Job satisfaction.* New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.

Huebner, A. J., Walker, J. A., & McFarland, M. (2003). Staff development for the youth development professional: A critical framework for understanding the work. *Youth and Society, 35*(2), 204-225.

Hutchins, G. K. (1990). Agent specialization and the 4-H PRK model. *Journal of Extension, 28*(4). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1990winter/a3.php

Igodan, O. C., & Newcomb, L. H. (1986). Are you experiencing burnout? *Journal of Extension, 24*(1). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1986spring/a1.php

Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1983). Preventing employee burnout. *Personnel, 60*(2), 58-68.

Jewell, L. R., Beavers, K. C., Kirby, B. J., & Flowers, J. L. (1990). Relationships between levels of job satisfaction expressed by North Carolina vocational agriculture teachers and their perceptions towards the agricultural education teaching profession. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 31*(1), 52-57.

Johnson, N., Oliff, P., & Williams, E. (2010). *Center on budget and policy priorities update on state budget cuts*. Retrieved from http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa+=view&id=1214

Kalambokidis, L. (2004). Identifying the public value in Extension programs. *Journal of Extension, 42*(2). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2004april/a1.php

Kersey, A. P. (1998). Job satisfaction, dissatisfaction and career commitment among community based youth development professionals (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida). Retrieved from http://apps.libraries.psu.edu/agnic/theiss_record.cfm?studyID=1151

Kutilek, L. M. (2000). Learning from those who leave. *Journal of Extension, 38*(3). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2000june/iw2.html

Kutilek, L. M., Conklin, N. L., & Gunderson, G. (2002). Investing in the future: Addressing work/life issues of employees. *Journal of Extension, 40*(1). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2002february/a6.php

Livestrong. (2010). *Preventing Burnout*. Survey to measure burnout. Retrieved from http://www.livestrong.com/article/14719-preventing-burnout/

Long, J. L., & Swortzel, K. A. (2007). Factors influencing job satisfaction of Extension agents in the Mississippi State University Extension Service. *Proceedings of the American Association for Agricultural Education Research Conference, Minneapolis, MN, 34*,41-53.

Mallilo, A. (1990). Extension staff satisfaction. *Journal of Extension, 28*(2). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1990summer/rb5.html

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 2*, 99-113.

Miller, G. (2010, June 7). Demand rising for agricultural college graduates [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://blogs.usda.gov/2010/06/07/demand-rising-for-agricultural-college-graduates/

Mind Tools. (2010). *Burnout self test: Checking yourself for burnout*. Retrieved from http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newTCS_08.htm

Moore, G. (2008). Why teach agriculture? It beats working! *The Agricultural Education Magazine, 80*(5), 11-12.

Montana State University.(2010). Montana State University Extension Field Office Directory. Retrieved from http://msuextension.org/directory.

Mor Barak, M. E., Levin, A., Nissly, J. A., & Lane, C. J. (2006). Why do they leave? Modeling child welfare workers' turnover intentions. *Children & Youth Services Review, 28*(5), 548-577.

National Institute of Food and Agriculture. (2008). *Salary analyses of Cooperative Extension Service positions report*. Retrieved from www.csrees.usda.gov/about/human_res/pdfs/report2008.pdf

Near, J. P., Rice, R. W., & Hunt, R. G. (1978). Work and extra-work correlates of life and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 21*, 248-264.

New Unionism Network. (2004). *Burnout survey*. Retrieved from http://www.newunionism.net/library/working%20life/Tools%20-%20Burnout%20Survey%20-%202004.doc

Odell, K. S., Cochran, J. E., Lawrence, L. D., & Gartin, S. A. (1990). The job and marital satisfaction of secondary agriculture teachers and their spouses. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 31*(3), 14-18.

Oregon State University. (2010). *County office location directory*. Retrieved from http://extension.oregonstate.edu/locations.php

Petty, G. C., Brewer, E. W., & Brown, B. (2005). Job satisfaction among employees of a youth development organization. *Child & Youth Care Forum, 34*(1), 57-73.

Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational work and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin, 80*, 151-176.

Place, N. T., Jacob, S. G., Summerhill, W. R., & Arrington, L. R. (2000). Balancing work and family: Professional development needs of Extension faculty. *Proceedings from the National Agricultural Education Research Conference*, San Diego, CA, *27*, 180-192.

Preston, C. (2007, March 22). Burnout, low pay may drive young charity workers away, survey finds. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*. Retrieved from http://philanthropy.com/article/Burnout-Low-Pay-May-Drive/55156

Riggs, K., & Beus, K. B. (1993). Job satisfaction in Extension. *Journal of Extension, 31*(2). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1993summer/a5.html

Rousan, L. M., & Henderson, J. L. (1996). Agent turnover in Ohio State University Extension. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 37*(2), 7-15.

Safrit, R. D., Gliem, R. R., Gliem, J. A., Owen, M., & Sykes, W. (2009). A quantitative study of retention of North Carolina Cooperative Extension county program professionals. *Proceedings of the American Association for Agricultural Education Research Conference* , Louisville, KY. Retrieved from http://www.aaaeonline.org/files/national_09/papers/14.pdf

Senyurekli, A. R., Dworkin, J., & Dickinson, J. (2006). On-line professional development for Extension Educators. *Journal of Extension, 44*(3). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2006june/rb1.php

Smith, A., & Day, J. (2008). What message are you sending? *The Agricultural Education Magazine, 80*, 8-9.

Smith, N. G. (1980). *The perceived management system as related to job satisfaction in the Maryland Cooperative Extension Service* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland). Retrieved from http://apps.libraries.psu.edu/agnic/thesis_record.cfm?studyID=347

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*, 693-713.

Stark, C. B. (2008). *4-H faculty and staff workload survey preliminary results.* Unpublished report, University of Idaho Extension 4-H Youth Development, Moscow.

Stone, B., & Rennekamp, R. (2004). *New foundations for the 4-H youth development profession: 4-H professional research, knowledge, and competencies study, 2004.* Conducted in cooperation with the National 4-H Professional Development Task Force. 4-H National Headquarters, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture. Retrieved from http://www.national4-hheadquarters.gov/library/4-Hprkc_study_010605.pdf

Strong, R., & Harder, A. (2009). Implications on maintenance and motivation factors on Extension agent turnover. *Journal of Extension, 47*(1). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2009february/a2.php

Subramaniam, A., Heck, K., & Carlos, R. (2008, Winter). *4-H staff professional development: Identifying training needs across the state. Community Youth Development Report.* Retrieved from the University of California-Davis Center for 4-H Youth Development: http://cyd.ucdavis.edu/publications/pubs/report/pdf/cyd_report_08summer.pdf

Tilburg, E. V. (1988). Performance role contingencies: The role and relationships of perceived equity in the job performance-job satisfaction question. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 29*(2), 25-31.

United States Department of Agriculture. (2010). *About us.* Retrieved from http://www.csrees.usda.gov/qlinks/extension.html

United States Department of Agriculture .(2011). *2007 census of agriculture – farm numbers* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/Online_Highlights/Fact_Sheets/farm_numbers.pdf

University of Idaho. (2010). *Extension personnel directory*. Retrieved from http://www.extension.uidaho.edu/admin/personnel.asp

University of Wyoming. (2010). Area/county/state offices. Retrieved from www.uwyo.edu/ces/areas/index.html.

Voke, H. (2002, May). *Retaining quality teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Information Brief of the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wagner, S. E. (2006). Staff retention: From "satisfied" to "engaged." *Nursing Management*, 37(3), 24-29.

Walker, W. D., Garton, B. L., & Kitchel, T. J. (2004). Job satisfaction and retention of secondary agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 45*(2), 28-38.

Washington State Department of Social & Health Services. (2007). *Washington State children's administration workload study*. Retrieved from http://www.dshs.wa.gov/pdf/ca/WLS%20Summary%20Report%2011-2007.pdf

Washington State University. (2010). *Washington State 4-H program staff directory*. Retrieved from http://4h.wsu.edu/staffdir/counties.html

Watson, L. W., & Hillison, J. (1991). Temperament type and job satisfaction among selected West Virginia agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 32*(4), 25-30.

Wessel, T., & Wessel, M. (1982). *4-H: An American idea 1900-1980*. Chevy Chase, MD: National 4-H Council.

Wright, T. A., Bennett, K. K., & Dun, T. (1999). Life and job satisfaction. *Psychological Reports, 84*, 025-1028.

APPENDIX A. IRB APPROVAL FORMS

NDSU NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Institutional Review Board
Office of the Vice President for Research, Creative Activity, and Technology Transfer
NDSU Dept. 4000
1735 NDSU Research Park Drive
Research 1, PO Box 6050
Fargo, ND 58108-6050

October 14, 2010

Myron Eighmy
School of Education
EML 216C

IRB Expedited Review of: "**The Workload of Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals and the Correlation to Job Satisfaction and Burnout in Six Western States**". Protocol **#HE11064**
Co-investigator(s) and research team: **Carrie Stark**

Research site(s): **varied** Funding: **n/a**

The protocol referenced above was reviewed under the expedited review process (category # 7) on **10/11/2010**, and the IRB voted for ☐ approval ☒ approval, contingent on minor modifications. These modifications have now been accepted. IRB approval is based on the original submission, with revised recruitment emails (received 10/14/2010).

Approval expires: 10/10/2011 **Continuing Review Report Due: 9/1/2011**

Please note your responsibilities in this research:

- All changes to the protocol require approval from the IRB prior to implementation, unless the change is necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazard to participants. Submit proposed changes using the *Protocol Amendment Request Form*.
- All research-related injuries, adverse events, or other unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others must be reported in writing to the IRB Office within 72 hours of knowledge of the occurrence. All significant new findings that may affect risks to participation should be reported in writing to subjects and the IRB.
- If the project will continue beyond the approval period, a *continuing review report* must be submitted by the due date indicated above in order to allow time for IRB review and approval prior to the expiration date. The IRB Office will typically send a reminder letter approximately one month before the report due date, however, timely submission of the report is your responsibility. Should IRB approval for the project lapse, recruitment of subjects and data collection must stop.
- When the project is complete, a final project report is required so that IRB records can be inactivated. Federal regulations require that IRB records on a protocol be retained for three years following project completion. Both the continuing review report and the final report should be submitted according to instructions on the *Continuing Review Completion Report Form*.
- Research records may be subject to a random or directed audit at any time to verify compliance with IRB regulations.

Thank you for cooperating with NDSU IRB policies, and best wishes for a successful study.

Sincerely,
Kristy Shirley

Kristy Shirley, CIP
Research Compliance Administrator

APPENDIX B. EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE TO POTENTIAL RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Sent 10/18/2010

Dear 4-H Youth Development Professionals,

Hello. My name is Carrie Stark, and I am a doctorate student at North Dakota State University in Adult and Occupational Education (as well as a 4-H Youth Development Specialist at the University of Idaho). I am working on my dissertation and would like to ask you to help in my research by completing the survey. My dissertation topic "THE WORKLOAD OF EXTENSION 4-H YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONALS AND THE CORRELATION TO JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT IN SIX WESTERN STATES" is going to help determine the workload for Extension 4-H Youth Development professionals, based on a set of common, predetermined job responsibilities related to the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies (4-H PRKC) and the correlation of that workload to job satisfaction and burnout.

The survey should take you approximately 20 to 40 minutes to complete. The survey will be available to complete between October 18th through November 2nd. If you would like to participate, the link to the survey is:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TGFQM5H

Thank you for your support in this study. I would be happy to share the final results with each of your states. The purpose of this study is to determine what the workload looks like for the Extension 4-H Youth Development professional and how that correlates to job satisfaction and burnout. Because both workload and job satisfaction may be factors in which individuals leave a job, it is important determine what the workload actually is and how it correlates to job satisfaction and burnout for the Extension 4-H Youth Development professionals so that they can determine how to efficiently use their time to get the job done. Completing this study will hopefully give those who hire, mentor and supervise (as well as those who live it day-to-day) some tools to help figure this out.

Thank you,
Carrie Stark
NDSU Doctoral Student-Education
University of Idaho Extension 4-H Youth Development Specialist
208-885-2156
estark *a* uidaho.edu

Sent 10/25/2010

Dear 4-H Professionals-

Thank you to everyone who has completed the survey for my dissertation, entitled "The Workload of Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals and the Correlation to Job Satisfaction and Burnout in Six Western States." For those of you who have not had a chance to complete it, there are still 7 days left.

The survey should take you approximately 20 to 40 minutes to complete. The survey will be available until November 1st. If you would like to participate, the link to the survey is:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TGFQM5H

Thank you for your support in this study. I would be happy to share the final results with each of your states. The purpose of this study is to determine what the workload looks like for the Extension 4-H Youth Development professional and how that correlates to job satisfaction and burnout. Because both workload and job satisfaction may be factors in which individuals leave a job, it is important determine what the workload actually is and how it correlates to job satisfaction and burnout for the Extension 4-H Youth Development professionals so that they can determine how to efficiently use their time to get the job done. Completing this study will hopefully give those who hire, mentor and supervise (as well as those who live it day-to-day) some tools to help figure this out.

Thank you,
Carrie Stark
NDSU Doctoral Student-Education
University of Idaho Extension 4-H Youth Development Specialist
208-885-2156
cstark@uidaho.edu

Sent 11/1/2010

Dear 4-H Professional,

This is one final reminder to please complete the survey for the study entitled "The Workload of Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals and the Correlation to Job Satisfaction and Burnout in Six Western States."

Thank you to everyone who has taken the time to complete the survey. I appreciate your help in looking at this important topic to the Extension 4-H Youth Development professional.

Again, the survey should take you approximately 20 to 40 minutes to complete. It will be available to complete until the end of the day tomorrow, November 2nd. If you would like to participate, the link to the survey is:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TGFQM5H

Thank you,
Carrie Stark
NDSU Doctoral Student-Education
University of Idaho Extension 4-H Youth Development Specialist
208-885-2156
cstark@uidaho.edu

Sent 11/2/2010

Dear Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals,

Thank you to all of the 4-H Youth Development professionals who have taken the time to complete the survey for my dissertation "The Workload of Extension 4-H Youth Development Professional and the Correlation to Job Satisfaction and Burnout in Six Western States." Your time and expertise in this area have helped to guide this research project.

For those of you who still want to complete the survey, you have one last chance. The survey deadline has been extended until November 9th. Please take 20 to 40 minutes to complete this survey. The survey link is:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TGFQM5H

Again, thank you for your support in this study. I would be happy to share the final results with each of your states. The purpose of this study is to determine what the workload looks like for the Extension 4-H Youth Development professional and how that correlates to job satisfaction and burnout. Because both workload and job satisfaction may be factors in which individuals leave a job, it is important determine what the workload actually is and how it correlates to job satisfaction and burnout for the Extension 4-H Youth Development professionals so that they can determine how to efficiently use their time to get the job done. Completing this study will hopefully give those who hire, mentor and supervise (as well as those who live it day-to-day) some tools to help figure this out.

Thank you,
Carrie Stark
NDSU Doctoral Student-Education
University of Idaho Extension 4-H Youth Development Specialist
208-885-2156

cstark@uidaho.edu

Sent 11/8/2010

Dear Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals,

This is your final chance to please complete the survey for the study entitled "The Workload of Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals and the Correlation to Job Satisfaction and Burnout in Six Western States."

A big thank you to everyone who has taken the time to complete the survey. I appreciate your help in looking at this important topic to the Extension 4-H Youth Development professional.

Again, the survey should take you approximately 20 to 40 minutes to complete. It will be available to complete until the end of the day Tuesday, November 9th. If you would like to participate, the link to the survey is:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TGFQM5H

Thank you and have a wonderful week!
Carrie Stark
NDSU Doctoral Student-Education
University of Idaho Extension 4-H Youth Development Specialist
208-885-2156
cstark@uidaho.edu

APPENDIX C. COVER LETTER AND SAMPLE INSTRUMENT

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

1. Informed Consent

North Dakota State University
School of Education
NDSU Department 2625
P.O. Box 6050
Fargo, ND 58108-6050

The Workload of Extension 4-H Youth Development Professionals and the Correlation to Job Satisfaction and Burnout in Six Western States

My name is Carrie Stark. I am a graduate student in Education at North Dakota State University. I am conducting an NDSU research project to determine the correlation between the workload and job satisfaction and burnout of 4-H Youth Development professionals. It is my hope that with this research, I will learn more about how those professionals who work in 4-H Youth Development spend their time and be able to determine what factors contribute to low job satisfaction and burnout.

Because you are employed by a Land Grant University Extension system and have some 4-H Youth Development responsibilities in your position description, you are invited to participate in this research. Your participation is voluntary and you may decline or withdraw from participation at any time, without penalty.

There are no foreseen risks or discomforts that may occur in the event of your participation.

The purpose of this study is to determine the work load for Extension 4-H Youth Development professionals, based on a set of common, predetermined job responsibilities and the correlation of that work load to job satisfaction and burnout. The study will utilize quantitative methods for gathering data from Extension professionals who work within the 4-H Youth Development program at the six Land Grant University Extension systems in the Western region.

It should take between 25-40 minutes to complete the on-line questionnaire, which asks you about the amount of time you spend with 4-H Youth Development job responsibilities, your job satisfaction and burnout. The on-line survey will be open for 2 weeks (between October 4, 2010 through October 18, 2010.

Although you may be identified in the information we collect, your identity will not be revealed in the research results, and your responses will remain confidential. Only group comparisons will be made and reported in summary form; identifiers will be removed once the report is final.

If you have any questions about this project, please call me 208-301-8681, email cstark@uidaho.edu or call my advisor Dr. Myron Eighmy at 701-231-5775, e-mail at myron.eighmy@ndsu.edu.

You have rights as a research participant. If you have questions about your rights or complaints about this research, you may talk to the researcher or contact the NDSU Human Research Protection Program at 701 231 8908, ndsu.irb@ndsu.edu, or by mail at: NDSU HRPP Office,NDSU Dept 4000, PO Box 6050, Fargo, ND 58108-6050.

Thank you for your taking part in this research. If you wish to receive a copy of the results, please contact me at cstark@uidaho.edu or 208-301-8681.

Sincerely,

Carrie Stark

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

1. Please select one statement below

- ◯ I read and understand the Informed Consent above and agree to participate in this study
- ◯ I have read the Informed Consent above and have decided not to participate in this study

2. Personal Data

Instructions: Please supply the information requested. This information will be used for statistical purposes only in analyzing the data collected. Do not include your name in this survey.

*** 1. Gender**

- ◯ Male
- ◯ Female

*** 2. Age**

- ◯ 18-23
- ◯ 24-29
- ◯ 30-39
- ◯ 40-49
- ◯ 50-59
- ◯ 60+

*** 3. Highest Degree Attained**

- ◯ High School Diploma
- ◯ Associate's Degree
- ◯ Bachelor's Degree
- ◯ Master's Degree
- ◯ Doctorate Degree

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 4. What is your primary role in 4-H Youth Development?**

- ◯ 4-H Program Assistant (County)
- ◯ 4-H Program Coordinator (County)
- ◯ County Extension Educator/Agent
- ◯ Area/District/Regional Extension Educator/Agent
- ◯ County Director/Chair
- ◯ State Extension Associate/Program Coordinator/Program Assistant
- ◯ State Specialist
- ◯ State Program Leader
- ◯ Other (please give specific job title)

*** 5. What percentage of your position description is 4-H Youth Development**

*** 6. Which Land Grant University Extension system do you currently work for?**

- ◯ University of Idaho Extension
- ◯ Oregon State University Extension
- ◯ Washington State University Extension
- ◯ Montana State University Extension
- ◯ Colorado State University Extension
- ◯ University of Wyoming Extension
- ◯ Other (please specify)

*** 7. Years working in 4-H Youth Development?**

*** 8. Years in present position?**

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 9. How long do you plan to remain in the field of Extension 4-H Youth Development?**

- ◯ I plan to remain with Extension until I am eligible for retirement
- ◯ I will retire within the next 5 years
- ◯ Leave my current position within 1 year but stay with 4-H Youth Development
- ◯ Leave Extension 4-H Youth Development between the next 1 to 5 years (not due to retirement)
- ◯ Leave Extension/4-H Youth Development within 1 year (not due to retirement)
- ◯ Don't know
- ◯ Other (please specify)

10. What size is the 4-H Youth Development program you work with (How many youth are enrolled or are participants)?

3. Workload-4-H PRKC Domains

There are six domains, which make up the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge and Competencies (4-H PRKC, 2004). These domains include competencies, which are important for all 4-H Professionals to be proficient in. This is the basis for determining how time is alloted to your job.

The following are the definitions for each of the six domains:

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT domain is defined as utilizing the knowledge of the human growth and development process to create environments that help youth reach their full potential

YOUTH PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT domain is defined as planning, implementing, and evaluating programs that achieve youth development outcomes

VOLUNTEERISM domain is defined as building and maintaining a volunteer management system for the delivery of youth development programs

EQUITY, ACCESS & OPPORTUNITY domain is defined as interacting effectively and equitable with diverse individuals and building long-term relationships with diverse communities

PARTNERSHIPS domain is defined as engaging youth in community development and the broader community in youth development

ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEMS domain is defined as positioning the organization and its people to work with and on behalf of young people most effectively

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 9. How long do you plan to remain in the field of Extension 4-H Youth Development?**

- ◯ I plan to remain with Extension until I am eligible for retirement
- ◯ I will retire within the next 5 years
- ◯ Leave my current position within 1 year but stay with 4-H Youth Development
- ◯ Leave Extension 4-H Youth Development between the next 1 to 5 years (not due to retirement)
- ◯ Leave Extension/4-H Youth Development within 1 year (not due to retirement)
- ◯ Don't know
- ◯ Other (please specify)

10. What size is the 4-H Youth Development program you work with (How many youth are enrolled or are participants)?

3. Workload-4-H PRKC Domains

There are six domains, which make up the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge and Competencies (4-H PRKC, 2004). These domains include competencies, which are important for all 4-H Professionals to be proficient in. This is the basis for determining how time is alloted to your job.

The following are the definitions for each of the six domains:

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT domain is defined as utilizing the knowledge of the human growth and development process to create environments that help youth reach their full potential

YOUTH PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT domain is defined as planning, implementing, and evaluating programs that achieve youth development outcomes

VOLUNTEERISM domain is defined as building and maintaining a volunteer management system for the delivery of youth development programs

EQUITY, ACCESS & OPPORTUNITY domain is defined as interacting effectively and equitable with diverse individuals and building long-term relationships with diverse communities

PARTNERSHIPS domain is defined as engaging youth in community development and the broader community in youth development

ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEMS domain is defined as positioning the organization and its people to work with and on behalf of young people most effectively

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 9. How long do you plan to remain in the field of Extension 4-H Youth Development?**

- ◯ I plan to remain with Extension until I am eligible for retirement
- ◯ I will retire within the next 5 years
- ◯ Leave my current position within 1 year but stay with 4-H Youth Development
- ◯ Leave Extension 4-H Youth Development between the next 1 to 5 years (not due to retirement)
- ◯ Leave Extension/4-H Youth Development within 1 year (not due to retirement)
- ◯ Don't know
- ◯ Other (please specify)

10. What size is the 4-H Youth Development program you work with (How many youth are enrolled or are participants)?

3. Workload-4-H PRKC Domains

There are six domains, which make up the 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge and Competencies (4-H PRKC, 2004). These domains include competencies, which are important for all 4-H Professionals to be proficient in. This is the basis for determining how time is alloted to your job.

The following are the definitions for each of the six domains:

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT domain is defined as utilizing the knowledge of the human growth and development process to create environments that help youth reach their full potential

YOUTH PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT domain is defined as planning, implementing, and evaluating programs that achieve youth development outcomes

VOLUNTEERISM domain is defined as building and maintaining a volunteer management system for the delivery of youth development programs

EQUITY, ACCESS & OPPORTUNITY domain is defined as interacting effectively and equitable with diverse individuals and building long-term relationships with diverse communities

PARTNERSHIPS domain is defined as engaging youth in community development and the broader community in youth development

ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEMS domain is defined as positioning the organization and its people to work with and on behalf of young people most effectively

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 1. Please indicate how much time you currently spend on each of the 6 domains of the 4-H PRKC. (Answers must equal 100%)**

Youth Development Domain	
Youth Program Development Domain	
Volunteerism Domain	
Equity, Access & Opportunity Domain	
Partnership Domain	
Organizational Systems Domain	

*** 2. Please indicate how much time you think you SHOULD spend on each of the 6 domains of the 4-H PRKC. (Answers should equal 100%)**

Youth Development Domain	
Youth Program Development Domain	
Volunteerism Domain	
Equity, Access & Opportunity Domain	
Partnership Domain	
Organizational Systems Domain	

*** 3. Please indicate the level of job satisfaction for your work in each of the six PRKC domains**

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	*Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied*	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	N/A
Youth Development Domain	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Youth Program Development Domain	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Volunteerism Domain	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Equity, Access & Opportunity Domain	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Partnership Domain	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Organizational Systems Domain	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Other (please specify)

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 4. How does your work associated with each of the six domains of the PRKC contribute to your work burnout?**

	To a Very Small Degree	To a Small Degree	Somewhat	To a Large Degree	To a Very Large Degree	N/A
Youth Development Domain	○	○	○	○	○	○
Youth Program Development Domain	○	○	○	○	○	○
Volunteerism Domain	○	○	○	○	○	○
Equity, Access & Opportunity Domain	○	○	○	○	○	○
Partnership Domain	○	○	○	○	○	○
Organizational Systems Domain	○	○	○	○	○	○

Other (please specify)

*** 5. Please indicate how much your level of job satisfaction has changed in the past 3-4 years for the work responsibilities in each of the six PRKC domains**

	Has Increased	Hasn't Changed	Has Decreased	N/A
Youth Development Domain	○	○	○	○
Youth Program Development Domain	○	○	○	○
Volunteerism Domain	○	○	○	○
Equity, Access & Opportunity Domain	○	○	○	○
Partnership Domain	○	○	○	○
Organizational Systems Domain	○	○	○	○

Comment

4. Workload-Youth Development Competencies

The following section focuses on the amount of time you spend in the area of Youth Development. Youth Development is defined as utilizing the knowledge of the human growth and development process to create environments that help youth reach their full potential.

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 1. Below are job responsibilities that are common to the 4-H Youth Development professional, related to the 4-H PRKC Domain of Youth Development. Please rank order them 1 to 7, with 1 being the job responsibility you spend the most time doing and 7 being the one you spend the least amont of time completing.**

1. Participate in professional development opportunities (*credit courses, seminars, workshops*, online workshops, reading books, etc) related to the growth and development of youth-physical, cognitive, social and emotional *development*
2. *Create programs* that are responsive to the social and emotional development of youth
3. Provide opportunities for youth in the exploration in multiple skills in project areas (Example *day camps, overnight* camps,etc.)that promote positive outcomes for youth by providing support, relationships, and opportunities
4. Create positive *relationships with youth, volunteers, families*, and community partners
5. Set up environments and programs to promote positive behavior while implementing strategies to deal with negative behaviors in appropriate ways
6. Articulate and develop programs that allow youth the opportunity to *practice life skills*
7. *Demonstrate an* understanding of conflict management and resolution with 4-H volunteers and/or members

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 2. This question is asking about your job satisfaction and the level it causes burnout for each of the following job responsibilities.**

The scale for Job Satisfaction is:
1-Extremely Satisfied
2-Satisfied
3-Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied
4-Dissatisfied
5-Extremely Dissatisfied

The scale for Burnout is:
1-To a very small degree
2-To a small degree
3-Somewhat
4-To a large degree
5-To a very large degree

	Job Satisfaction	Causes Burnout
1. Participate in professional development opportunities (credit courses, seminars, workshops, online workshops, reading books, etc) related to the growth and development of youth-physical, cognitive social and emotional development		
2. Create programs that are responsive to the social and emotional development of youth		
3. Provide opportunities for youth in the exploration in multiple skills in project areas (Example: day camps, overnight camps,etc)that promote positive outcomes for youth by providing support, relationships, and opportunities		
4. Create positive relationships with youth, volunteers, families, and community partners		
5. Set up environments and programs to promote positive behavior while implementing strategies to deal with negative behaviors in appropriate ways.		
6. Articulate and develop programs that allow youth the opportunity to practice life skills		
7. Demonstrate an understanding of conflict management and resolution with 4-H volunteers and/or members		

Comment

5. Workload-Youth Program Development Competencies

The following section focuses on the amount of time you spend in the area of Youth Development. Youth Program Development is defined as planning, implementing and evaluating programs that achieve youth development outcomes.

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 1. Below are job responsibilities that are common to the 4-H Youth Development professional, related to the 4-H PRKC Domain of Youth Program Development. Please rank order them 1 to 7, with 1 being the job responsibility you spend the most time doing and 7 being the one you spend the least time completing.**

1. Use current research and obtain citizen perspectives (through community forums, focus groups, interviews or surveys) to help identify program opportunities. ☐
2. Work with advisory boards and committees to obtain input regarding program priorities ☐
3. Identify potential community partners and collaborators and establish those partnerships. ☐
4. Use a framework (example: logic model) for program planning and communicate program plans to relevant stakeholders ☐
5. Select, develop, adapt and/or utilize quality youth development curricula, which is based on current research and knowledge ☐
6. Incorporate and use evaluation into program design and Communicate evaluation results to appropriate stakeholders (impact statements, with county commissioners, 4-H volunteers, etc) ☐
7. Lead committees or design teams through the process of developing programs ☐

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 2. This question is asking about your job satisfaction and the level it causes burnout for each of the following job responsibilities.**

The scale for Job Satisfaction is:
1-Extremely Satisfied
2-Satisfied
3-Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied
4-Dissatisfied
5-Extremely Dissatisfied

The scale for Burnout is:
1-To a very small degree
2-To a small degree
3-Somewhat
4-To a large degree
5-To a very large degree

	Job Satisfaction	Causes Burnout
1. Use current research and obtain citizen perspectives (through community forums, focus groups, interviews or surveys) to help identify program opportunities		
2. Work with advisory boards and committees to obtain input regarding program priorities		
3. Identify potential community partners and collaborators and establish those partnerships		
4. Use a framework (example: logic model) for program planning and communicate program plans to relevant stakeholders		
5. Select, develop, adapt and/or utilize quality youth development curricula, which is based on current research and knowledge		
6. Incorporate evaluation into program design and Communicate evaluation results to appropriate stakeholders (impact statements, with county commissioners, 4-H volunteers, etc)		
7. Lead committees or design teams through the process of developing programs		

Comment

6. Workload-Volunteerism Competency

The following section focuses on the amount of time you spend in the area of Volunteerism. Volunteerism is defined as building and maintaining volunteer management system for he delivery of youth development programs.

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 1. Below are job responsibilities that are common to the 4-H Youth Development professional, related to the 4-H PRKC Domain of Volunteerism. Please rank order them 1 to 7, with 1 being the job responsibility you spend the most time doing and 7 being the one you spend the least amount of time completing.**

1. Make use of volunteer teams/committees to manage change and the 4-H Youth Development program
2. Conduct potential volunteer interviews, reference checks, and criminal background checks (*volunteer selection process*) and instruct the initial volunteer orientation (new leader training) for all new volunteers in your county
3. *Provide educational opportunities for volunteers* on youth development theory, organizational operations, personal development, relevant subject-matter and *organizational leadership strategies*
4. Conduct and provide regular/routine performance feedback to volunteers
5. Promote and implement appropriate intrinsic and extrinsic *recognition strategies for volunteers*
6. Develop or utilize existing written volunteer position descriptions
7. Implement multiple recruitment strategies for volunteers

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 2. This question is asking about your job satisfaction and the level it causes burnout for each of the following job responsibilities.**

The scale for *Job Satisfaction* is:
1-Extremely Satisfied
2-Satisfied
3-Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied
4-Dissatisfied
5-Extremely Dissatisfied

The scale for Burnout is:
1-To a very small degree
2-To a small degree
3-Somewhat
4-To a large degree
5-To a very large degree

	Job Satisfaction	Causes Burnout
1. Make use of volunteer teams/committees to manage change and the *4-H Youth Development* program		
2. Conduct potential volunteer interviews, reference checks and criminal background checks (*volunteer selection process*) and instruct the *initial volunteer orientation (new leader training)* for all new *volunteers in your county*		
3. Provide educational opportunities for volunteers on *youth development theory, organizational* operations, *personal development, relevant subject-matter* and organizational leadership strategies		
4. Conduct and provide regular/routine performance feedback to volunteers		
5. Promote and implement appropriate intrinsic and extrinsic recognition strategies for volunteers		
6. Develop or utilize existing written volunteer position descriptions		
7. Implement multiple recruitment strategies for volunteers		

Comment

7. Workload-Equity, Access and Opportunity Competency

The following section focuses on the amount of time you spend in the area of Equity, Access and Opportunity. Equity, Access and Opportunity is defined as when on interacts effectively and equitable with diverse individuals and building long-term relationships with diverse communities.

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 1. Below are job responsibilities that are common to the 4-H Youth Development professional, related to the 4-H PRKC Domain of Equity, Access and Opportunity. Please rank order them 1 to 7, with 1 being the job responsibility you spend the most time doing and 7 being the one you spend the least amont of time completing.**

1. Build relationships of trust, safety, and mutual respect with the many different individuals and groups in your community
2. Use appropriate marketing techniques, such as personal marketing, and/or ethnic marketing of 4-H programs you work with
3. Recruit, support, and retain diverse volunteers
4. *Engage local, diverse community-based individuals in advisory committees and/or volunteer opportunities, etc*
5. Establish goals and accountability measures to ensure diversity in *program participation and content*
6. Provide training, resources, and support for faculty, staff and/or volunteers at all levels around equity, access and opportunity
7. Design materials and information that reflect the needs of diverse communities

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 2. This question is asking about your job satisfaction and the level it causes burnout for each of the following job responsibilities.**

The scale for Job Satisfaction is:
1-Extremely Satisfied
2-Satisfied
3-Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied
4-Dissatisfied
5-Extremely Dissatisfied

The scale for Burnout is:
1-To a very small degree
2-To a small degree
3-Somewhat
4-To a large degree
5-To a very large degree

	Job Satisfaction	Causes Burnout
1. Build relationships of trust, safety, and mutual respect with the many different individuals and groups in your community.		
2. Use appropriate marketing techniques, such as personal marketing, and/or ethnic marketing of 4-H programs you work with.		
3. Recruit, support, and retain diverse volunteers		
4. Engage local, diverse community-based individuals in advisory committees and/or volunteer opportunities etc		
5. Establish goals and accountability measures to ensure diversity in program participation and content		
6. Provide training, resources, and support for faculty, staff and/or volunteers at all levels around equity, access and opportunity		
7. Design materials and information that reflect the needs of diverse communities		

Comment

8. Workload-Partnerships Competency

The following section focuses on the amount of time you spend in the area of Partnerships. The Partnership competency is defined as engaging youth in community development and the broader community in youth development.

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 1. Below are job responsibilities that are common to the 4-H Youth Development professional, related to the 4-H PRKC Domain of Partnerships. Please rank order them 1 to 7, with 1 being the job responsibility you spend the most time doing and 7 being the one you spend the least amont of time completing.**

1. Assess the readiness of young people and adults to engage as partners and facilitate youth involvement on 4-H boards and committees. ☐

2. Articulate the continuum of youth engagement (objects, recipients, resources, partners) to volunteers and stakeholders, as well as advocate for the engagement of young people ☐

3. Provide an opportunity for young people to lead and structure real world opportunities for leadership training ☐

4. Organize or join a community coalition to address current needs ☐

5. Help young people acquire workforce skills and abilities and help them understand and articulate their 4-H experiences as "work" experiences ☐

6. Foster an environment that provides support to youth who are organizing for community change and encourage critical thinking throughout that change and ensure adequate representation of young people in all areas of decision making ☐

7. Build capacity of existing governing bodies to accept youth members and build the capacity of young people who serve on governing boards ☐

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 2. This question is asking about your job satisfaction and the level it causes burnout for each of the following job responsibilities.**

The scale for Job Satisfaction is:
1-Extremely Satisfied
2-Satisfied
3-Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied
4-Dissatisfied
5-Extremely Dissatisfied

The scale for Burnout is:
1-To a very small degree
2-To a small degree
3-Somewhat
4-To a large degree
5-To a very large degree

	Job Satisfaction	Causes Burnout
1. Assess the readiness of young people and adults to engage as partners and facilitate youth involvement on 4-H boards and committees.		
2. Articulate the continuum of youth engagement (objects, recipients, resources, partners) to volunteers and stakeholders, as well as advocate for the engagement of young people		
3. Provide an opportunity for young people to lead and structure real world opportunities for leadership training		
4. Organize or join a community coalition to address current needs		
5. Help young people acquire workforce skills and abilities and help them understand and articulate their 4-H experiences as "work" experiences		
6. Foster an environment that provides support to youth who are organizing for community change and encourage critical thinking throughout that change and ensure adequate representation of young people in all areas of decision making		
7. Build capacity of existing governing bodies to accept youth members and build the capacity of young people who serve on governing boards		

Comment

9. Workload-Organizational Systems Competency

The following section focuses on the amount of time you spend in the area of Organizational Systems. The Organizational Systems competency is defined as positioning the organization and its people to work with and on behalf of young people most effectively.

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 1. Below are job responsibilities that are common to the 4-H Youth Development professional, related to the 4-H PRKC Domain of Organizational Systems. Please rank order them 1 to 7, with 1 being the job responsibility you spend the most time doing and 7 being the one you spend the least amont of time completing.**

1. Plan, manage, and embrace change within the county and/or state 4-H program by establish effective program governance and management structures (i.e. committees, boards, policies, etc) in accordance with organizational policy and procedures ☐
2. Develop and maintain public relations efforts and work effectively with the media ☐
3. Collect and report data and enrollments (4-H Plus or other enrollment management programs. ES-237) ☐
4. Work with volunteers and staff to assess and plan for potential risks (Risk management) and follow insurance/liability policy and procedures ☐
5. Facilitate appropriate financial management practices by volunteers and participants when handling program financial matters ☐
6. Contributes to the knowledge base of the youth development field/profession and provide the research-based information to the public ☐
7. Seeks professional affiliations that will enhance the youth development profession and your own professional knowledge base (Example-NAE4-HA) ☐

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 2. This question is asking about your job satisfaction and the level it causes burnout for each of the following job responsibilities.**

The scale for Job Satisfaction is:
1-Extremely Satisfied
2-Satisfied
3-Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied
4-Dissatisfied
5-Extremely Dissatisfied

The scale for Burnout is:
1-To a very small degree
2-To a small degree
3-Somewhat
4-To a large degree
5-To a very large degree

	Job Satisfaction	Causes Burnout
1. Plan, manage, and embrace change within the county and/or state 4-H program by establish effective program governance and management structures (i.e. committees, boards, policies, etc) in accordance with organizational policy and procedures		
2. Develop and maintain public relations efforts and work effectively with the media		
3. Collect and report data and enrollments (4-H Plus or other enrollment management programs, ES-237).		
4. Work with volunteers and staff to assess and plan for potential risks (Risk management) and follow insurance/liability policy and procedures		
5. Facilitate appropriate financial management practices by volunteers and participants when handling program financial matters		
6. Contributes to the knowledge base of the youth development field/profession and provide the research-based information to the public		
7. Seeks professional affiliations that will enhance the youth development profession and your own professional knowledge base (Example-NAE4-HA)		

Comment

10. Other Work Load Items

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

1. Please share three (3) additional job responsibilities that require your time as a 4-H Youth Development professional

A
B
C

* 2. How many hours do you work in a typical week?

Fall (September, October November)
Winter (December, January, February)
Spring (March, April, May)
Summer (June, July, August)

* 3. Please indicate the average number of weekends (either a Saturday or Sunday or both) you work per month.

* 4. Please indicate the average number of night meetings you attend per month (not overnight trips).

* 5. On average, how many nights are you out-of-town on work-related business per year.

Example of out-of-town: You attend a training in another town and you spend the entire night in a hotel. You would count those nights you spent the entire night away from home. Do not count those nights you travel back home at the end of the event.

11. Job Satisfaction Survey

Please choose the answer for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

* 1. Job Satisfaction

	Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	Agree very much
1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
2. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
4. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
5. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
6. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
7. I like the people I work with.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
8. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
9. Communications seem good within this organization.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
10. Raises are too few and far between.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
11. Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
12. My supervisor is unfair to me.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
13. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
14. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
15. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
16. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
17. I like doing the things I do at work.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
18. The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
19. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

20. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
21. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
22. The benefit package we have is equitable.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
23. There are few rewards for those who work here.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
24. I have too much to do at work.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
25. I enjoy my coworkers.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
26. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
27. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
28. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
29. There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
30. I like my supervisor.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
31. I have too much paperwork.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
32. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
33. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
34. There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
35. My job is enjoyable.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
36. Work assignments are not fully explained.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

*** 2. Overall, my job satisfaction is...**

- ◯ Extremely Satisfied
- ◯ Satisfied
- ◯ Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied
- ◯ Dissatisfied
- ◯ Extremely Dissatisfied

Comment/Other

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

3. What are the three biggest contributors that affect job satisfaction in a positive way?

1.
2.
3.

4. What are the three biggest contributors that affect job satisfaction in a negative way?

1.
2.
3.

5. Comments

12. Burn Out Survey

Please select the answer for each statement that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

*** 1. Please rate the following statements based on how you feel about your job at this time.**

	Agree very much	Agree moderately	Agree slightly	Disagree slightly	Disagree moderately	Disagree very much
1. I am tired of trying	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
2. I get emotionally involved in your work	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3. I lack initiative	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
4. I feel my work is always unfinished or unending	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
5. I am not as healthy as I should be	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
6. I feel misunderstood or unappreciated by my co-workers	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
7. I often think, "I can't take this anymore."	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
8. I believe I can cope with most situations in my life.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
9. I feel worn out at the end of the working day.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
10. I feel "defeated" like I'm up against a brick wall.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
11. I feel that what I do in my daily life is meaningful	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
12. I worry about losing my job	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
13. I am able to talk or be social with my colleagues while I am working	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
14. I tend to be prone to negative thinking about my job	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
15. I am often emotionally exhausted	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
16. No matter what I do, things on the job don't seem to get any better	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
17. I have influence on WHAT I do at work	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
18. I have not had time to relax or enjoy myself	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
19. Temporarily removing myself from the job seems to resolve my feelings	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
20. I often feel run down and drained of physical energy	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
21. I am tired of working with 4-H clients, including members and volunteers.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
22. I feel that I am in the wrong organization or the	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

wrong profession

23. I seem to get sick a little easier than other people.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
24. I find it harder to be sympathetic with people	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
25. I am frustrated with parts of my job.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
26. My work is emotionally demanding.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
27. I feel motivated and involved in my work	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
28. In the past 4 weeks I have had a hard time concentrating at work	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
29. I am physically exhausted more than 3 days a week.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
30. I find myself getting easily irritated by small problems, or by my co-workers or 4-H clientele	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
31. I no longer have enough time to attend to my family or personal needs.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
32. I find it harder to go to work in the mornings or taking more sick days than usual with little reason	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
33. I feel there is little support from fellow workers	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
34. I feel there is more work to do than I have the ability to do	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
35. I feel disillusioned and resentful about the people with whom I work with (4-H volunteers and/or members)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
36. I often achieve less than I know I should	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
37. I receive all of the information that I need in order to do my work well	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
38. My work is meaningful	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
39. I feel that I give more than I get back when I work with clients	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
40. I often get behind in my work	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Carrie Stark-Dissertation Survey

2. Overall, how burned out do you feel at work?

- ◯ To a very small degree
- ◯ To a small degree
- ◯ Somewhat
- ◯ To a large degree
- ◯ To a very large degree

Comment

3. What are the three biggest contributors that affect your feeling of burnout?

1
2
3

13. Thank you

Thank you!

APPENDIX D. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Table D1. Demographic Statistics of Survey Participants

Variable	Number	Percentage
Gender (N = 241)		
Male	54	22.4%
Female	187	77.6%
Age (N = 241)		
18-23 Years	1	0.4%
24-29 Years	38	15.8%
30-39 Years	55	22.8%
40-49 Years	50	20.7%
50-59 Years	77	32.0%
Over 60 Years	20	8.3%
Highest Degree Attained (N = 241)		
High School Diploma	11	4.6%
Associate's Degree	11	4.6%
Bachelor's Degree	77	32.0%
Master's Degree	130	53.9%
Doctoral Degree	12	5.0%
Primary Role in 4-H (N = 241)		
County Program Assistant	20	8.3%
County Program Coordinator	40	16.6%
County Extension Educator	125	51.9%
Area/Regional/District Extension Educator	8	3.3%
County Director/Chair	12	5.0%
State Extension Associate/Program Coordinator/Assistant	10	4.1%
State Specialists	10	4.1%
State Program Leader	4	1.7%
Other Job Titles	12	5.0%
Land-Grant University (N = 241)		
University of Idaho	56	23.2%
Oregon State University	44	18.3%
Washington State University	38	15.8%
Montana State University	47	19.5%
Colorado State University	41	17.0%
University of Wyoming	14	5.8%
Not Reported	1	0.4%

Table D1. (Continued)

Variable	Number	Percentage
Percentage of Position is 4-H Youth Development Work (N = 241)		
1-10%	6	2.5%
11-19%	5	2.0%
20-29%	16	6.4%
30-39%	9	3.6%
40-49%	12	4.8%
50-59%	23	9.2%
60-69%	7	2.8%
70-79%	15	6.0%
80-89%	10	4.0%
90-99%	13	5.2%
100%	121	54.6%
Years Worked in 4-H Youth Development (N = 241)		
Under 1 Year	6	2.5%
1 - 3 Years	45	18.7%
4 - 6 Years	51	21.1%
7 - 10 Years	43	17.8%
11 - 15 Years	34	14.1%
16 - 20 Years	18	7.5%
21 - 25 Years	19	7.9%
26 - 30 Years	11	4.6%
Over 30 Years	14	5.8%
Years Worked in Current Position (N = 241)		
Under 1 Year	12	5.0%
1 to 3 Years	72	28.9%
4 to 6 Years	66	27.4%
7 to 10 Years	23	9.5%
11 to 15 Years	28	11.6%
16 to 20 Years	19	7.9%
21 to 25 Years	8	3.3%
26 to 30 Years	8	3.3%
Over 30 Years	5	2.1%

APPENDIX E. 4-H PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH, KNOWLEDGE, AND COMPETENCY (4-H PRKC) MODEL

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT DOMAIN

Utilizing the knowledge of the human growth and development process to create environments that help youth reach their full potential

TOPIC: GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (5-19 YEARS): The stages youth progress through as they grow physically, cognitively, socially and emotionally.

COMPONENT: Physical Development

- Identifies biological transitions of development
- Articulates how these transitions influence program design and adult youth relationships
- Understands the affects of nutrition and exercise on growth and development

COMPONENT: Cognitive Development

- Recognizes cognitive stages across age groups
- Facilitates the growth in thinking from concrete to abstract
- Understands how the cognitive stages inform program design and the need for age-appropriate curriculum

COMPONENT: Social & Emotional Development

- Recognizes the changing role of peers
- Creates programs that are responsive to these changes.
- Identifies the stages of identity development
- Provides opportunities for exploration in multiple skill or project areas
- Aware of the signs of emotional and mental stress

TOPIC: YOUTH DEVELOPMENT THEORY

COMPONENT: Positive Youth Development

- Intentionally designs programs to promote positive outcomes for youth through the provision of opportunities, relationships, and supports
- Understands history, changes and trends of the roles of youth in society
- Recognizes transitions and the role of rites of passage in youth development
- Recognizes gender differences in learning and participation

COMPONENT: Ecological Model

- Recognizes the influence of multiple contexts on youth development
- Articulates the impact of these contexts on youth development for specific situations
- Recognizes the cultural and structural differences for various youth within systems

COMPONENT: Resiliency Theory

- Recognizes risk and protective factors
- Maps risk and protective factors
- Designs programs and create relationships that maximize protective factors and minimize risks

TOPIC: YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PRACTICE: *The integration of youth development growth and development and youth development theory into the actual activities planned and implemented in a program.*

COMPONENT: Relationship Building

- Creates a positive relationship at all levels with youth, families, and community partners
- Maintains appropriate emotional and physical boundaries with youth
- Maintains a mentor-learner relationship with youth and volunteers
- Understands impacts of adult role models and mentoring, and is aware of community referral and intervention opportunities
- Demonstrates character and models proper behaviors

COMPONENT: Behavior Management

- Sets up environments and programs to promote positive behavior
- Implements personal and group strategies to deal with inappropriate behavior in appropriate and affirming ways
- Demonstrates understanding of conflict management and resolution
- Models positive behavior and provides leadership for others in this area

COMPONENT: Programming for Life Skill Development

- Articulates the relationship between program activities and life skills.
- Ensures activities are intentionally designed to develop critical life skills
- Provides meaningful engagement for participants
- Uses or develops programs that allow youth the opportunity to practice life skills
- Articulates the importance of basic life skill development and age appropriate learning

YOUTH PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT DOMAIN

Planning, implementing, and evaluating programs that achieve youth development outcomes.

TOPIC: SITUATION ANALYSIS

COMPONENT: Accessing Existing Information

- Knows how to access existing sources of situational data
- Uses and interprets data from various sources
- Uses current research to help identify program opportunities

COMPONENT: Gathering Community Perspectives

- Knows methods and techniques for gathering data from both young people and adults (community forums, focus groups, interviews, surveys)
- Skilled in the use of appropriate methods and techniques for gathering community perspectives

COMPONENT: Setting Priorities and Securing Commitment

- Works with advisory boards and committees to obtain input regarding program priorities
- Determines significance and prioritizes problems and issues
- Identifies potential community partners and collaborators

TOPIC: PROGRAM DESIGN

COMPONENT: Theories of Change

- Understands and applies theories and approaches for facilitating change

COMPONENT: Design Frameworks

- Understands and subscribes to a framework for program planning (logic modeling, TOP, etc.)
- Facilitates program development using a planning framework
- Communicates program plans to relevant stakeholders
- Periodically reassesses program plans

COMPONENT: Curriculum Development

- Knows and applies experiential approaches to learning
- Knows characteristics of quality youth development curricula
- Selects, adapts, and utilizes curricula appropriately
- Develops curricula based on current research and knowledge

COMPONENT: Program Quality Standards

- Knows characteristics of effective youth development programs
- Applies quality standards in program design and delivery

COMPONENT: Evaluation Planning

- Incorporates evaluation planning into program design

TOPIC: PROGRAM DELIVERY

COMPONENT: Learning Strategies

- Identifies learning styles of participants
- Assesses contextual factors which affect learning
- Demonstrates ability to modify and adapt strategies in accordance with audience needs and other contextual factors

COMPONENT: Instruction

- Utilizes lesson plans or teaching outlines
- Understands and applies appropriate teaching methods
- Facilitates learning using various teaching techniques
- Uses appropriate equipment, devices, and technology in support of teaching and learning

TOPIC: PROGRAM EVALUATION

COMPONENT: Approaches and Perspectives

- Understands multiple approaches to evaluation
- Understands the difference between process and outcome evaluation

COMPONENT: Evaluation Design

- Develops meaningful evaluation questions
- Specifies appropriate indicators of change
- Selects evaluation methods appropriate for the evaluation question and indicators
- Develops a timeline for evaluation activities

COMPONENT: Evaluation Methods

- Skilled in the use of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods
- Knows protocols and procedures for collecting and handling data

COMPONENT: Analysis and Interpretation

- Knows procedures for analyzing quantitative and qualitative data
- Can interpret findings and articulate reasonable conclusions

COMPONENT: Communicating Evaluation Results

- Communicates evaluation results in a manner congruent with stakeholder needs

VOLUNTEERISM

Building and maintaining volunteer management system for the delivery of youth development programs

TOPIC: PERSONAL READINESS

COMPONENT: Philosophy of Volunteerism

- Develops and demonstrates personal philosophy of volunteerism in congruence with professional ethics
- Articulates a belief in the competence of volunteers
- Develops and/or supports an organizational philosophy of volunteerism

COMPONENT: Trends in Volunteerism

- Identifies and engages expanded, diverse audiences as both volunteers and recipients of volunteers' services
- Understands societal trends and adapts volunteer management strategies accordingly

COMPONENT: Advocating for Volunteerism

- Knows role of organizational volunteers and communicate benefits to community, organization, and individuals
- Identifies and nurtures staff/volunteer teams to manage change
- Educates peers and co-workers on the value of volunteerism

TOPIC: ORGANIZATIONAL READINESS

COMPONENT: Climate for Volunteerism

- Creates and supports a positive organizational environment for volunteerism
- Develops and supports staffing structures that align and support meaningful roles for volunteers

COMPONENT: Identifying Needs for Volunteers

- Develops and conducts community needs and assets assessments
- Develops and conducts organizational needs and assets assessments

COMPONENT: Developing Volunteer Positions

- Identifies potential volunteer roles and responsibilities
- Develops written volunteer position descriptions

TOPIC: ENGAGEMENT OF VOLUNTEERS

COMPONENT: Recruiting Volunteers

- Understands fundamentals of human motivation as related to volunteerism
- Understands and implements multiple recruitment strategies based upon position responsibilities and community demographics
- Communicates available positions to the community
- Knows and communicates roles and responsibilities for episodic, short-term, long-term, and virtual volunteer commitments
- Promotes different levels of responsibilities for volunteers
- Develops and disseminates applications to potential volunteers

COMPONENT: Selecting Volunteers

- Understands the purpose of appropriate selection strategies
- Identifies selection strategies appropriate for the volunteer position based upon the position's responsibilities, organizational policies, and the clientele to be served
- Conducts potential volunteer interviews, reference checks, and criminal background checks
- Identifies and matches individual motivations, skills and time commitment with available roles and responsibilities
- Evaluates and determines the appropriateness of individuals for volunteer position(s) for final placement

TOPIC: EDUCATION OF VOLUNTEERS

COMPONENT: Orientation of Volunteers

- Develops and conduct initial orientation to the organization
- Conducts on-going orientation that reflects organizational changes

COMPONENT: Education of Volunteers

- Provides educational opportunities for volunteers on youth development, organizational operations, personal development, etc.
- Provides educational opportunities for volunteers on relevant subject matter and organizational leadership strategies
- Provides educational opportunities for volunteers related to organizational policies and procedures

COMPONENT: Adult Development and Learning Theory

- Applies teaching and learning strategies appropriate for diverse adult audiences

TOPIC: SUSTAINABILITY OF VOLUNTEER EFFORTS

COMPONENT: Supervising, and Coaching Volunteers

- Delegates appropriate responsibilities to volunteers
- Supports a positive volunteer espirit des corps
- Motivates volunteers to stimulate creativity and reach potential
- Addresses behaviors not consistent with acceptable standards

COMPONENT: Performance Management of Volunteers

- Conducts and provides regular/routine performance feedback to volunteers
- Implements disciplinary strategies including remediation, counseling, probation, and dismissal

COMPONENT: Recognition of Volunteers

- Promotes and implements appropriate intrinsic and extrinsic recognition strategies for volunteers
- Provides and supports expanded leadership opportunities for volunteers

COMPONENT: Evaluation of Volunteer Efforts

- Develops and conducts impact assessment of volunteer efforts
- Communicates impact of volunteer efforts to stakeholders

EQUITY, ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITY DOMAIN

Interacting effectively and equitably with diverse individuals and building long-term relationships with diverse communities

TOPIC: AWARENESS

COMPONENT: Values, Norms and Practices

- Understands their own identities and how they shape your worldview
- Understands differing concepts of time and space and how they communicate meaning
- Understands differing body language, verbal expressions, and how they communicate meaning.
- Understands differing values, norms, practices, traditions

COMPONENT: Pluralistic Thinking

- Recognizes the validity of multiple perspectives
- Thinks openly without prejudging
- Thinks inclusively

COMPONENT: Power, Privilege and Policy

- Understands the effects of differences in historical power and privilege, including institutional privilege and internalized oppression.
- Knows laws and policies that promote and support diversity and pluralism.
- Knows history of diverse groups in America and the effect of historical events on present day behavior.
- Knowledgeable of prejudice, classism, homophobia, etc. and the origins of "isms"

TOPIC: SENSITIVITY

COMPONENT: Personal Readiness

- Seeks out and explores commonalities and differences (expand comfort zone) beyond one's own race/ethnicity, gender, religion, etc.
- Is proud of one's own identity and encourages others to do the same.
- Committed to learning about and working with people from varying backgrounds.
- Builds relationships of trust, safety and mutual respect with the many different individuals and groups.
- Acknowledges "not knowing" when you do not understand
- Committed to lifelong learning of about diverse individuals, groups and communities.
- Exhibits Self-awareness including one's cultural/social identities, assumptions, values, norms, biases, preferences, experience of privilege and oppression, and how they shape one's worldview.
- Displays an awareness of their own communication, learning, and teaching styles; acceptance of others' styles, and willingness to learn new skills to bridge differences

COMPONENT: Dimensions of Diversity

- Is aware of and open to youth and volunteers who are diverse based on Primary Dimensions of Diversity (more permanent, impossible or hard to change) such as: Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Sexual Orientation, Age, Physical Differences and Abilities, Learning Differences and Abilities
- Is aware and open to youth and volunteers who are diverse based on Secondary Dimensions of Diversity such as: Religion and Belief Systems, Socioeconomic Status, Family Structure, Language, Geographic (urban, rural, suburban)
- Exhibits and awareness of varying levels of assimilation or acculturation within groups

TOPIC: COMMUNICATION

COMPONENT: Open Attitude

- Reserves judgment in a cross-cultural interaction.
- Interrupts oppressive behavior (preserving the dignity of all people)
- Applies "mind set" to address conflict in a cross-cultural setting. Mind-set includes recognizing, understanding and knowing how to adapt to communication style differences such as direct and indirect, linear and circular, low-context and high-context.
- Reacts in a non-defensive manner
- Applies cultural knowledge to address conflicts and negotiate common ground

COMPONENT: Speaking Consciously

- Opens and continues dialogue in a non-threatening way.
- Communicates one's own perspective with clarity.
- Uses non-blaming language to talk about issues of difference.
- Disagreeing respectfully
- Demonstrates an awareness of the impact of words and actions

COMPONENT: Active Listening

- Listens in accordance with the cultural context.
- Provides feedback in order to check for mutual understanding.
- Listens deeply and encourages feedback as a means of gaining clarity in intended meaning.

TOPIC: RELEVANT PROGRAMMING

COMPONENT: Needs Assessment

- Gains sufficient, meaningful input of diverse communities/individuals to design programs
- Examines root causes of needs
- Expresses an openness to surprises – No predetermined needs
- Listens to individuals and not just data/statistics
- Involves community in the entire process

COMPONENT: Program Design

- Uses appropriate marketing techniques such as personal marketing, relationship marketing and/or ethnic marketing
- Uses applications and activities appropriate for the learner's needs
- Uses content that reflects the norms, values and preferences of the learners

COMPONENT: Program Implementation

- Considers accessibility, availability, neutrality, language, etc. when implementing programs
- Covers issues/topics on the subject that are important to the learners
- Provides application exercises for applying the ideas that would be interesting to the learner
- Uses examples relevant to the learners' life experiences
- Involves learners as partners in learning

COMPONENT: Collaboration

- Collaborates with diverse communities/individuals to assess their needs
- Engages local, diverse, community-based individuals in advisory committees, volunteer opportunities, etc.
- Engages local, grassroots organizations as equal partners with an equal voice in the programming process

TOPIC: INCLUSIVE ORGANIZATIONS

COMPONENT: Policies and Procedures

- Uses sensitive policies, procedures and practices
- Recruits, supports and retains diverse volunteers
- Fosters an Inclusive work environment where human differences and similarities are welcomed, valued, and utilized at all levels
- Encourages a nurturing environment where all employees have equal access to opportunities for personal and professional growth, recognition and rewards, as well as other opportunities
- Establishes goals and accountability measures to ensure diversity in program participation and program content

COMPONENT: Staffing and Staff Development

- Hires, retains and promotes diversity faculty and staff at all levels.
- Provides training, resources and support for faculty and staff at all levels

COMPONENT: Community Outreach

- Forges constructive alliances with local, grassroots community-based organizations to expand outreach to diverse communities
- Designs materials and information that reflects the needs of diverse communities
- Shows an awareness of existing assets and resources in diverse communities
- Knowledgeable of how to gain sufficient, meaningful input from diverse communities to design programs

PARTNERSHIPS DOMAIN

Engaging youth in community development and the broader community in youth development

TOPIC: YOUTH-ADULT PARTNERSHIPS

COMPONENT: Assessment and Readiness

- Assesses readiness of young people and adults to engage as partners
- Recognizes own strengths and limitations in engaging in youth adult partnerships
- Serves as a role model

COMPONENT: Continuum of Youth Engagement

- Articulates the continuum of youth engagement (objects, recipients, resources, partners)
- Advocates for the engagement of young people
- Provides examples of how to apply the continuum in youth work
- Possesses values consistent with youth engagement

COMPONENT: Creating Partnerships

- Creates safe, open, accepting environments for both youth and adults
- Fosters development of intergenerational relationships
- Ensures adequate representation of young people in all areas of decision making
- Facilitates dialogue that ensures a youth voice

COMPONENT: Building and Maintaining Partnerships

- Provides opportunities for young people to lead
- Builds youth capacity to lead
- Understands realistic expectations from youth and adults in partnerships
- Builds adult capacity to follow youth leadership
- Provides consistent encouragement for the growth of the partnership

TOPIC: YOUTH ACTION

COMPONENT: Youth Organizing

- Possesses ability to serve as a resource and ally to youth
- Fosters an environment that provides support to youth organizing for community change
- Provides access to resources, systems, and power structures
- Encourages critical thinking throughout community change

COMPONENT: Youth Advocacy

- Models appropriate channels and avenues for youth advocacy
- Speaks on behalf of underrepresented youth

COMPONENT: Youth Leadership

- Facilitates exploration of personal leadership styles
- Structures real world opportunities for leadership training
- Encourages young people to self-reflect on leadership experiences

COMPONENT: Youth in Governance

- Builds capacity of existing governing bodies to accept youth members
- Builds capacity of young people to serve on governing bodies
- Builds governing structures that incorporate youth voice
- Manages youth-adult interactions on governing bodies
- Models and engages youth in appropriate avenues for education and change in government

COMPONENT: Service Learning

- Develops and demonstrates a philosophy of service learning
- Helps young people identify issues and opportunities for service in local communities
- Supports young people in the process of community change

TOPIC: ORGANIZATIONAL ALLIANCES

COMPONENT: Assessment and Readiness

- Assesses readiness for organizational alliances
- Identifies opportunities for potential alliances
- Understands implications of organizational self-interest
- Understands the mission and programs of other youth serving organizations

COMPONENT: Networking

- Establishes and maintains effective professional networks
- Utilizes appropriate networks to acquire resources and information

COMPONENT: Cooperation

- Understands and respects roles of community agencies and organizations
- Cooperates to ensure efficiency in program delivery

COMPONENT: Partnerships

- Actively seeks out and initiates discussion with potential partners.
- Jointly designs, implements and evaluates youth programs with community partners
- Facilitates group processes to help achieve common goals

COMPONENT: Coalitions

- Organizes or joins community coalitions to address current issues

COMPONENT: Collaboration

- Identifies common interests for which collaborations can be formed
- Develops and sustains long-term relationships among coalition partners

TOPIC: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

COMPONENT: Analysis

- Assesses community assets and needs

COMPONENT: Tools and Processes

- Utilizes tools and processes which encourage and facilitate community development

COMPONENT: Government

- Understands and applies knowledge of governmental structures, systems, and policies

COMPONENT: Community Youth Development

- Engages broader community in youth development
- Engages young people in building strong communities
- Understands the interrelationships between youth and their communities

COMPONENT: Workforce

- Understands the nature of the local workforce
- Helps young people acquire skills and abilities for the workforce
- Helps young people understand and articulate their 4-H experiences as "work" experience
- Articulates to the public how 4-H contributes to career exploration and skill development
- Engages community in career development of young people

ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEM DOMAIN

Positioning the organization and its people to work with and on behalf of young people most effectively

TOPIC: ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

COMPONENT: Knowledge of the Organization

- Understands CES/4-H history, structure and mission
- Displays commitment to CES/4-H/mission

COMPONENT: Strategic Planning

- Uses mission and vision to shape programs and organizational structure
- Uses mission and vision for long-range planning
- Plans, manages and embraces change

COMPONENT: Program Governance

- Establishes appropriate management structures
- Creates governance policies
- Monitors and supports board and committee work

TOPIC: PERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS

COMPONENT: Management

- Sets priorities
- Manages time effectively
- Balances conflicting demands

COMPONENT: Work/Life Balance

- Incorporates wellness practices into personal life style
- Practices stress management and stress reduction

COMPONENT: Interpersonal Skills

- Listens effectively and actively
- Takes others' perspectives into account
- Manages conflicts effectively
- Demonstrates group facilitation skills

TOPIC: COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

COMPONENT: Diverse, targeted strategies

- Writes and speaks effectively for diverse audiences
- Possesses operational proficiency in use of the technology needed to function effectively in current position

COMPONENT: Marketing

- Develops and maintains public relations efforts
- Works effectively with the media
- Identifies target audiences and markets programs to meet their specific needs

COMPONENT: Accountability/Impact

- Collects and reports data, enrollments
- Establishes and manages communication flow
- Communicates program impacts to stakeholders

TOPIC: RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT

COMPONENTS: Budgets

- Develops and manages budgets
- Follows policies and standards for fund reporting

COMPONENT: Resource Development Stewardship

- Develops grants and proposals
- Follows policies and standards for resource development
- Plans and conducts fundraising activities
- Identifies and partners with donors and sponsors
- Integrates reporting and evaluation into resource development efforts

TOPIC: RISK MANAGEMENT

COMPONENT: People

- Works with volunteers and staff to assess and plan for potential risks
- Designs and maintains a safe, inclusive program environment for youth and adults
- Plans for special needs of participants
- Engages program participants in safety-awareness and self-protection practices
- Responds effectively to crises
- Understands and follows insurance/liability policies and procedures
- Understands youth legal systems (Child labor laws, community ordinances affecting youth, child protection issues, and school policies).

COMPONENT: Property

- Designs and monitors safe physical environments
- Works with volunteers and participants on stewardship and respect for property and resources.
- Provides appropriate care and accountability for physical property of the organization.

COMPONENT: Financial

- Understands and follows policies on fund stewardship
- Facilitates appropriate financial management practices by volunteers and participants when handling program financial matters.

COMPONENT: Goodwill/Image/Reputation Management

- Understands, follows and communicates policies regarding the 4-H name and emblem
- Understands and judiciously implements program policies and guidelines
- Develops proactive approaches to crisis response and communications

TOPIC: PROFESSIONALISM

COMPONENT: Ethics

- Demonstrates attributes of a positive role model
- Follows ethical standards of profession at all times
- Is accountable and accepts responsibility for actions

COMPONENT: Scholarship

- Applies research and best practices to all aspects of work
- Contributes to knowledge-base of the youth development field
- Provides research-based information to the public and collaborates with other youth development educators and professionals
- Seeks professional affiliations that will enhance the youth development profession and their own professional knowledge base

COMPONENT: Advocacy

- Promotes youth development profession
- Promotes the University
- Is a catalyst for response to needs of youth and family
- Partners and collaborates with other youth organization professionals at the national, state, and local levels.
- Promotes positive youth development to decision makers